

The Contested Theological Authority of Thomas Aquinas

*The Controversies between Hervaeus
Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain*



Elizabeth Lowe

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

The Contested Theological Authority of Thomas Aquinas

*The Controversies between Hervaeus
Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain*



Elizabeth Lowe

The Contested Theological
Authority of
Thomas Aquinas

*The Controversies between Hervaeus
Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain*



Elizabeth Lowe

THE CONTESTED THEOLOGICAL AUTHORITY OF THOMAS AQUINAS

MEDIEVAL HISTORY AND CULTURE VOLUME 17

STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL HISTORY AND CULTURE

Edited by

Francis G. Gentry

Professor of German

Pennsylvania State University

A ROUTLEDGE SERIES

STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL HISTORY AND CULTURE

FRANCIS G. GENTRY, *General Editor*

1. "AND THEN THE END WILL COME"

Early Latin Christian Interpretations of the Opening of the Seven Seals

Douglas W. Lumsden

2. TOPOGRAPHIES OF GENDER IN MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN RATHURIAN ROMANCE

Alexandra Sterling-Hellenbrand

3. CHRISTIAN, SARACEN AND GENRE IN MEDIEVAL FRENCH LITERATURE

Imagination and Cultural Interaction in the French Middle Ages

Lynn Tarte Ramey

4. WORD OUTWARD

Medieval Perspectives on the Entry into Language

Corey J. Marvin

5. JUSTICE AND THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF EARLY MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN LITERATURE

Robert G. Sullivan

6. MARRIAGE FICTIONS IN OLD FRENCH SECULAR NARRATIVES, 1170–1250

A Critical Re-evaluation of the Courtly Love Debate

Keith A. Nicklaus

7. WHERE TROUBADOURS WERE BISHOPS

The Occitania of Folc of Marseille (1150–1231)

N. M. Schulman

8. JOHN CASSIAN AND THE READING OF EGYPTIAN MONASTIC CULTURE

Steven D. Driver

9. CHOOSING NOT TO MARRY

Women and Autonomy in the Katherine Group

Julie Hassel

10. FEMININE FIGURAE

Representations of Gender in Religious Texts by Medieval German Women

Writers

Rebecca L. R. Garber

11. BODIES OF PAIN

Suffering in the Works of Hartmann von Aue

Scott E. Pincikowski

12. THE LITERAL SENSE AND THE GOSPEL OF JOHN IN LATE MEDIEVAL
COMMENTARY AND LITERATURE

Mark Hazard

13. THE REPRODUCTIVE UNCONSCIOUS IN LATE MEDIEVAL AND
EARLY MODERN ENGLAND

Jennifer Wynne Hellwarth

14. MYSTICAL LANGUAGE OF SENSE IN THE LATER MIDDLE AGES

Gordon Rudy

15. FAIR AND VARIED FORMS

Visual Textuality in Medieval Illustrated Manuscripts

Mary C. Olson

16. QUEENS IN THE CULT OF THE FRENCH RENAISSANCE MONARCHY

*Public Law, Royal Ceremonial, and Political Discourse in the History of
Regency Government, 1484–1610*

Elizabeth A. McCartney

THE CONTESTED THEOLOGICAL AUTHORITY OF THOMAS AQUINAS

The Controversies between Hervaeus Natalis
and Durandus of St. Pourçain

Elizabeth Lowe

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2003 by Routledge

Published 2013 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY, 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 2003 by Taylor & Francis Books, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Lowe, Elizabeth.

The contested theological authority of Thomas Aquinas : the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain / by Elizabeth Lowe.

p. cm. — (Studies in medieval history and culture ; v. 17)

Includes bibliographical references and index

1. Thomas, Aquinas, Saint, 1225?–1274. 2. Hervaeus Natalis, d. 1323. 3. Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, Bishop of Meaux, ca. 1275–1334. 4. Thomists—History. 5. Dominicans—History. 6. Theology, Doctrinal—History—Middle Ages, 600–1500. I. Title. II. Series.

BX4700.T6 .L69 2003

230'.2'09022—dc21

[B]

2002014650

ISBN 13: 978-0-415-94353-6 (hbk)

ISBN 13: 978-0-415-86943-0 (pbk)

Series Editor Foreword

Far from providing just a musty whiff of yesteryear, research in Medieval Studies enters the new century as fresh and vigorous as never before. Scholars representing all disciplines and generations are consistently producing works of research of the highest caliber, utilizing new approaches and methodologies. Volumes in the Medieval History and Culture series will include studies on individual works and authors of Latin and vernacular literatures, historical personalities and events, theological and philosophical issues, and new critical approaches to medieval literature and culture.

Momentous changes have occurred in Medieval Studies in the past thirty years in teaching as well as in scholarship. Thus the goal of the Medieval History and Culture series is to enhance research in the field by providing an outlet for monographs by scholars in the early stages of their careers on all topics related to the broad scope of Medieval Studies, while at the same time pointing to and highlighting new directions that will shape and define scholarly discourse in the future.

Francis G. Gentry

To Rev. Louis B. Pascoe, S.J.,
Thanks

Contents

ABBREVIATIONS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER ONE

THE DOMINICAN ORDER AND ITS EDUCATIONAL STRUCTURES

Charismatic Origins

Translation into an Institution

Early Growth

Study, Schools, and Scholars

Friar Preachers at the University

CHAPTER TWO

THE DOMINICAN INTELLECTUAL TRADITION

The Friar Preachers and the Methodology of the Schools

Aristotle among the Friar Preachers

Thomas Aquinas, the Condemnations, and Their Consequences

Dominican Reactions to the Condemnations

CHAPTER THREE

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE CONTROVERSIES

Early Dominican Thomists

The Predominance of the Augustinian Tradition, 1277–1307

The Antagonists

Herveaus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain

Conclusion

CHAPTER FOUR

SELECTED ISSUES IN THE CONTROVERSIES

The Debate over Relation

The Debate over Cognition

The Debate over Theology

CHAPTER FIVE

THE CONTROVERSIES AND THE QUESTION OF AQUINAS'

THEOLOGICAL AUTHORITY

Medieval Conceptions of Theological Authorities

Natalis' and Durandus' Concepts of *Auctoritas*

The Controversies and Aquinas' *Auctoritas*

CONCLUSION

ENDNOTES

WORKS CITED

INDEX

Abbreviations

Acta capitulorum generalium ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum, vol. 1: *ab anno 1220 usque ad annum 1303*.

Acta capitulorum generalium ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum, vol 2: *ab anno 1304 usque ad annum 1378*.

Acta canonizationis s. Dominici

Acta capitulorum propincialium ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum Première province de Provence, province Romaine, province d'Espagne (1239–1302).

Archivum Franciscanum Historicum

Archivum fratrum Praedicatorum

Archivum ad l'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du moyen âge

Archiv für Literatur-und-Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters

Opera Sacri ordinis Praedicatorum

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters: Texte und Untersuchungen

Bulletin Ordinis Praedicatorum

Continuatio Christianorum - Continuatio mediaevalis

Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy

Catholic Historical Review

Colloquia Aquinas, 1274–1974: commemorative studies

Constitutiones antiquae ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum, ed. A. H. Thomas in

De oudste Constituties van der Dominicanen: Voorgescheidenis., Tekst, Bronnen, Onstaan en Ontwikkeling (1214–1237) (Louvain, 1965), pp. 304–369.

Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis, Tom. I: *ab anno MCC usque ad annum MCCLXXXVI*, ed. H. Denifle and A. Chatelain, (Paris, 1889).

Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis, Tom II, *sectio prior: ab anno MCCLXXXVI usque ad annum MCCCL*, ed. H. Denifle and A. Chatelain (Paris: 1891).

Dictionary of the Middle Ages

Douais, Essai sur l'organisation des études dans l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs au treizième et au quatorzième siècle (1216–1342): Première province de Provence – province de Toulouse.

Faust's Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie

Galbraith, Gordon, The Constitution of the Dominican Order 1216 to 1360.

Gerardus de Fréhe, *Vita fratrum ordinis Praedicatorum necnon chronica ordinis ab anno MCCIII usque ad MCCLIV*.

Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIII^e siècle*.

Guarbas of St. Pourçain. In *Petri Lombardi sententias theologicas commentariorum libri IIII* (Venetiis: ex typographica Guerraea, 1571).

HS Histoire littéraire de la France

HS Brucker historischen Studien

JH Journal of ecclesiastical history

Johns of Saxony, *Libellus Ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. H.-C. Scheeben, *Monumenta historica sancti patris nostri Dominici*: 1–88.

Koch, *Durandus de S. Porciano, O.P. Forschungen zum Streit um Thomas v. Aquin zu Beginn des 15 Jahrhunderts*, published as *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters* 26

Historia diplomatica sancti Dominici, ed. M. H. Laurent

Monumenta diplomatica S. Dominici, ed. V. Koudelka

Monumenta historica sancti patris nostri Dominic

MO *Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum historica*

Moraeus Natalis. In *quatuor Libros sententiarum Commentaria*, ed. Dionysius Moraeus (Paris: Moraeus, 1546; reprinted Westmead: Gregg Press, 1966).

MP *Poloniae Philosophica Polonorum*

Pl *Philologiae cursus completus: series latina*.

RS *Revue des sciences religieuses*

RA *Archives de théologie ancienne et médiévale*

SO *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*.

Thomas, *Constituties van der Dominicanen: Voorgescheidenis, Tekst, Bronnen, Onstann, en Ontwikkeling 1215–1237*.

TR *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*

Zimaraeus Natalis, *Subtilissima Hervei Natalis Britonis theologi acutissimi quolibeta undecim cum octo ipsius profundissimis tractatibus infra per ordinem descriptis*, ed. M. A. Zimara (Paris: Zimara, 1513; reprinted, Ridgewood, NJ: Gregg, 1966).

ZK *Schrift für Kirchengeschichte*

ZK *Schrift für katholische Théologie*

Acknowledgments

AS IS NO DOUBT TRUE OF EVERY OTHER EXAMPLE OF THE GENRE, THIS dissertation would not have been possible had it not been for the aid and support of others. Thus, I would like to express my gratitude to the Andrew W. Mellon Fellowship, which provided the funding necessary to consult many of the primary sources upon which this dissertation is based. On a more basic level, I would like to express my gratitude to Fordham University for the years of financial aid that made this degree possible; and to the History Department faculty for securing that aid for me. But the formal acts of institutions are brought about by the individuals who make them work and it is to these whom I feel the greatest debts of gratitude.

Particular thanks should go to Dr. Maryanne Kowaleski whose selfless efforts at guiding graduate students through the labyrinths of degree requirements and over the hurdles entailed in grant applications are, perhaps, without parallel. I am also grateful to Father James Keenan for his encouragement over the years. Many thanks are also owed to the members of my committee: Dr. Richard Gyug, Fr. Gerald McCool, Fr. Thomas Shelley and Dr. John McCarthy, each of whom graciously took time out from their busy schedules to read through and comment upon this dissertation.

I have often thought that Heaven's Office of Central Casting pulled a double shift when it assigned the faculty which would guide my studies in religious and intellectual history, for what I have learned from each, as scholars and as people, is beyond measure. Thus, I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Donald Treadgold, whose lectures first inspired me to switch my major to history; and to Caroline Walker Bynum, whose quiet seminars introduced me to the unexpected lure of the scholastics' ideas and the texts in which they were embedded. At Fordham, the ebullience which Fr. John Meyendorff nearly always displayed in and out of class never failed to remind me of the sheer joy of doing history; and my conversations with Fr. Richard Smith, S.J., taught me the value of tempering high flown ideas and inspiring rhetoric with common sense. More than anyone else, however, I would like to thank my mentor, Louis B. Pascoe, S.J., who forced me to really learn the

languages needed for the discipline; provided me with the vast majority of my exegetical skills; taught me to reflect upon the meanings and nuances of words; and throughout our acquaintance, has saved me from innumerable egregious errors. Even after all of these years of trying his patience, he remains one of the most thoroughly decent and remarkable human beings I've ever met.

I have also accumulated debts of gratitude, throughout this long and arduous process, to a number of librarians. Dr. Charles Ermantinger, of the Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Library at St. Louis University, himself, served as an invaluable reference source. Paul Spaeth at the Friedsam Library at St. Bonaventure University arranged for me to have access to nearly impossible to find secondary sources and incunabula. Charlotte Labbe and Betty Garity of our own Interlibrary Loan department procured for me an almost never-ending supply of relevant (and some irrelevant) monographs and articles. I should also like to thank my boss, Michael Wares, and his superiors, Tom Cragge and Dr. McCabe, for allowing me to take the time needed to finish; and my colleagues, Bill Sullivan, Eileen McArdle, Bob Borress and Barbara Goonan for shouldering my fair share of the load in my absence.

THE CONTESTED THEOLOGICAL AUTHORITY OF THOMAS AQUINAS

Introduction

THE CONTROVERSIES: ISSUES AND SCHOLARSHIP

SYNCHRONOUS TO THE CONVULSIONS OCCASIONED BY THE FRANCISCAN Spirituals within the Order of the Friars Minor, the Order of the Friars Preachers underwent its own prolonged identity crises during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The parallels between the two religious institutes during this period are striking. Both suffered from a gradual diminution of prestige, influence and vocations. Both were plagued by constant ecclesiastical censorship and, at times, condemnation of their theologians. Internally, each was afflicted by a general decline in the practice of the religious life and by intense factional strife generated by conflicting interpretations of their charisms. But while the drama within the Franciscan Order revolved around the issue of religious poverty, that of the Dominicans centered upon the teachings, both theological and philosophical, of Thomas Aquinas. But here the parallel ends. For whereas the threat posed by the Franciscan Spirituals was representative of a sweeping, even predominant, trend within the Church; that posited by Aquinas' early Dominican followers was not.

Viewed squarely within the context of the critical half-century which followed the Condemnations of 1277, the theological currents within the Order of Preachers are intriguing, for they seem to have run counter to those which were sweeping through the rest of the Church. Promulgated in Paris by Bishop Étienne Tempier on March 7, 1277, the third anniversary of Aquinas' death, and two weeks later on March 18 by Robert Kilwardy, the Archbishop of Canterbury, these ecclesiastical censures were as much a part of the conservative backlash against Aristotelianism, and the rationalist currents associated with it, as countermeasures against heresy. Significantly, most scholastics believed that some of Aquinas' teachings had been included in the Condemnations. But whereas other institutions within the Church reacted to the Condemnations of 1277 by appropriating a fideistic approach to theology, the Order of Preachers responded by re-emphasizing the rational. Similarly, in stark contrast to the "pregnant plurality" which characterized the philosophical

speculation within the Augustinian spectrum, Dominican theology became increasingly homogenous.

Closer examinations of their historical context merely render the Dominicans' adoption of Thomism even more enigmatic. Championing Aquinas' teachings, at this point in time, could have done nothing to bolster the Dominicans' status within the Church. Not only did most scholastics believe that propositions drawn from Thomas' teachings had been thoroughly condemned in 1277, but the pope, the majority of bishops, most Franciscans and the secular *magistri* who dominated the university theological faculties had aligned in a formidable opposition to the Aristotelianism with which Aquinas' teachings were then commonly associated. Moreover, despite Thomas' prestige during his own lifetime, most Dominican scholastics, like their non-Dominican counterparts, were not only firmly rooted in the Augustinian tradition but wary of the alien outlook which Aquinas' teachings represented.

Retracing the steps by which the Friar Preachers embarked upon the solitary *via Thomae*, it quickly becomes evident that the Dominican Order was propelled, step by step, by an intermittent series of doctrinal wars between to groups of Dominican *magistri*; namely, Aquinas' early Dominican followers and their more conservative neo-Augustinian brethren. Spanning the years between 1290 and 1334, the schisms produced by these wars transgressed the confines of the Dominican convents; and constituted the Order's first (and perhaps only) public spectacle of disunity among its ranks¹. Between 1307 and 1323, debate within the Dominican Order reached its climax in a series of bitter polemical battles between Hervaeus Natalis [ca. 1250–1323], the most prominent of Aquinas' early followers and the eventual Master General of the Dominican Order, and Durandus of St. Pourçain [1275–1334], the Order's *enfant terrible* and the last major Dominican thinker to openly attack Aquinas' teachings. Originating as an intra-Dominican dispute, the theological controversies between Natalis and Durandus soon escalated into an ideological imbroglio which held captive the fascination of their contemporaries in the schools for more than a decade and a half. Concurrent to the controversies, Thomas Aquinas acquired an *auctoritas*, or a theological authority, within the Dominican Order which surpassed even that of Augustine.

The significance of Aquinas' acquisition of *auctoritas* within the Order of Preachers was profound. While the schools of thought which arose in the thirteenth century were the product of the universities; those which distinguished the scholasticism of the fourteenth were generated largely by the religious orders. In other words, the sequence and resolution of the controversies transformed the "Dominican school" into the Thomistic school, thereby launching it on a trajectory by which it would serve as a counterweight to the predominantly Augustinian theological currents in the late Middle Ages.

Despite the singular importance which the controversies between Hervaeus

Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain had in the history of the Order of Preachers, they have failed to attract the notice of ecclesiastical historians. This is not to say that there have not been a surfeit of Dominican histories. But these works focus mainly on the Order's glory days of the early- and mid-thirteenth century. With the exception of the more generic, traditional histories of the Order, the Dominican experience in the late and early fourteenth centuries has been left unstudied². Moreover, even these monographs pass rapidly over the controversies, condensing their treatment into a page or two, or less.

Until now, treatments of the conflict between Natalis and Durandus have been, for the most part, confined to intellectual histories. Yet, even these have been few and far between, limited, for the most part, to three narrowly defined issues extrapolated from the controversies. Of these, those scholarly examinations of Natalis' and Durandus' disputes over the nature of the sacraments, written in the 1970's, do meet the canons of contemporary scholarship³. To a lesser extent, so too do the investigations into their debate over free will⁴. Less objective and more colored by the theological debates of the first half of this century are the assessments of their conflict over original sin⁵. Overall, however, these studies are a-historical in nature, concerned neither with the context in which the debates took place nor with the historical ramifications they yielded.

Almost all contemporary historiography on the theological maelstrom which revolved around Durandus of St. Pourçain is, to some extent, derived from the published corpus of Joseph Koch [1885–1967]⁶. Prior to Koch's research, little was known about Durandus and even less about the stormy doctrinal wars which his writings generated. Koch's achievement was threefold. First, he identified, dated and catalogued most of Durandus' then-extant works. Secondly, he published many of the titles to many of Durandus' *quaestiones*, as well as extracts taken from some of Durandus' more controversial polemics, thereby providing the scholarly community with the fundamental topics about which Durandus was concerned and around which the controversies revolved. Third, although his chronology has since been modified, Koch laid the basic plot of the historical drama with which subsequent medievalists would become involved.⁷

In publishing the results of his research in the late 1920's and early 1930's, Koch blazed a new path into hitherto unexplored intellectual terrain. But he did not chart it. The extensive documentation which he brought forth out of the archives of Europe has proved to be marred by some, if not many, lacunae. Koch did pay some attention to Durandus' conflict with the Order of Preachers, but only insofar as it affected the development of the young Dominican's theology⁸. These limits to Koch's investigations do not detract from his herculean accomplishments. Koch, himself, regarded these works as little more than initial forays into the intellectual world of Durandus of St. Pourçain. Finally, the dissertation which necessitated Koch's research (and

hence, his later publications) was primarily concerned with the extent to which Durandus could be labeled a nominalist. In fact, it may well be precisely in his concern with the development of the new-Augustinian tradition during the early fourteenth century that Koch has left his most lasting legacy. Rarely are the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain treated in any significant depth within the histories of Thomism.

When one considers the plethora of works on Thomas and Thomism published during the last eighty years, the scarcity of studies on Thomism during the first fifty years after Aquinas' death seems curious⁹. One reason for this historiographical lacuna has been ideological. Disregarded by Gilson's generation due to their failure to pass an anachronistic litmus test on the unity of forms, late medieval Dominican thinkers have also been neglected by contemporary scholars who, more favorable to Augustinianism than their neo-scholastic predecessors, have sought to replace the pro-Thomist portrayal of late medieval Dominican intellectual history now entombed in the seminal histories of scholasticism. Deeper reasons for our present ignorance of the origins and early history of Thomism can be found in the historiographical trends in our own century—most notably the shift by Church historians away from the older German models of intellectual and political history towards a focus on the popular religion as presented in the works of Etienne Delaruelle, Jean Leclercq and Herbert Grundmann.

Considering the vast barren spaces in our knowledge of the topic left by previous scholarly expeditions, the natural question to ask, of course, is why did the Dominican Order choose to adopt Thomism when it did and in the way that it did? Solving such a puzzle necessitates the systematic investigation of a plethora of lesser problems, not least of which is a reconsideration of the basic assumptions underpinning the question: such as the precise nature of early fourteenth-century Thomism; the coherence and defining features of the early

Thomist school; and the extent to which the later rhetoric of the Dominican hierarchy reflected the actual beliefs and teachings of the early fourteenth-century Dominican theologians. Fully pursuing such inquiries would far exceed the scope of any dissertation. This dissertation, nevertheless, provides a foundation for future work by illuminating the relationship between the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain, on the one hand; and the growth of the *auctoritas* of Thomas Aquinas within the Order Preachers, on the other.

THE CONTROVERSIES: SOURCES

Reflecting its interdisciplinary nature, this dissertation draws heavily from two genres of primary sources: ecclesiastical records and scholastic works. Of the extant ecclesiastical records consulted, most originated from within the Dominican Order¹⁰. Fundamental to any understanding of the Dominican Order, its governmental structure and the juridical relationship of that

structure with its members is the Order's *Constitutions*¹¹. More revealing, however, are the endless statutes, exhortations, and admonitions recorded in the acts of the general and provincial chapters¹². Equally, if not more illuminating are the letters, commentaries and Dominican-oriented manuals written by prolific medieval Dominicans, such as Jordan of Saxony and the ever-pragmatic Humbert of Romans¹³. Formulaic but still helpful are the encyclical letters of the Dominican Master Generals¹⁴. Rounding out this group of basic Dominican primary sources is an assortment of chronicles, histories and hagiographies written by medieval Dominicans, often in an official capacity.¹⁵

Supplementing these documents are the records of other ecclesiastical institutions which, although not primarily concerned with the Order of Preachers, not only fill in some of the lacunae left by lost or missing Dominican documentation but provide glimpses of the Order from other perspectives. Papal bulls detail the rights and privileges accorded the Dominicans under any given pope¹⁶. Documents drawn up in other religious institutions and in the universities can be exploited for various types of data¹⁷. University records not only detail the relationship between the Dominican Order and the universities but, by depicting broader, Church-wide trends in the reception of Aristotelian corpus, provide another context in which to contemplate the controversies. Similarly, occasional consultations of the constitutions and *acta* of the other mendicant orders not only yield information regarding their relationship with the Order of Preachers but, by the contrasts which they give, deepen our understanding of the Dominican identity.

With regard to the sources central to the debate between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain, unfortunately, not all of the polemical tracts exchanged by the two Dominicans were available for consultation. Not surprisingly, there are more extant works attributed to Durandus. An indefatigable polemicist, Natalis was involved in innumerable public disputes. Moreover, his position as Master General and his reputation for orthodoxy no doubt helped to secure the survival of his works. Unfortunately, however, the vast majority of his extant works remains unedited.¹⁸

A greater proportion of Durandus' writings have been lost. This is especially true for Durandus' earlier writings and is due primarily to the destruction of many of these works within the Dominican *studia* at the behest of general and provincial chapters¹⁹. Other manuscripts, such as Durandus' *Excusationes*, were obliterated by the bombing of European cities during World War II. Some of the *quodlibetals* are simply no longer extant. Medieval and early modern catalogs, as well as internal evidence embedded in later tracts point to the existence of earlier works which have never been unearthed and identified by scholars²⁰. Other works are only partially extant. In these cases, portions of tracts and single *quaestiones* were transcribed into miscellaneous manuscripts which are still extant although the original work has long since perished. The

most striking example of this last group is the first redaction of Durandus' commentary on the *Sentences*, of which only the first two books are extant²¹. Others still are scattered far and anon throughout the archives of Europe, spread so thinly as to render their consultation by any one scholar impracticable, if not impossible.

But while many of the antagonists' polemics are either fragmentary or completely missing, it is possible to discern the fundamental trajectories of their theologies, as well as those of their arguments, by repairing to other sources. One such avenue has been provided by the scholastic practice of using copious quotations to disprove an opponent's argument. Natalis' *De articulis pertinentibus ad quatuor libros Sententiarum Durandi* and *Reprobationes excusationum Durandi* do much to fill the lacunae resulting from the loss of the texts which they are refuting²². Similarly, Peter of Palude's commentary on the *Sentences*, which was as much an explication of Durandus' deviation from Thomas as it was a gloss on the Lombard's magnum opus, provides us with not only invaluable information on Durandus' earliest theories, but Natalis' rejoinders as well²³. Another deposit of such information are the syllabi of errors promulgated by the Dominican commissions charged with examining Durandus' writings in 1314 and 1317. Like Peter of Palude, the compilers of these lists claim to have proffered exact transcriptions of Durandus' own writings²⁴. Finally, yet another major source for the antagonists earlier thought are their later writings. A prolific controversialist, Natalis often recycled his earlier writings for later debates. Similarly, Durandus' third redaction of his commentary on the *Sentences*, although containing an altered (and hence, less offensive) terminology is, in many areas, a veritable tribute to recidivism.

On the whole, however, most of what is here is based directly on the polemics exchanged by Natalis and Durandus. This corpus of documents can be divided into two groups. The first of these is their commentaries, of which we are relying primarily upon the 1546 printed version of Natalis' *In quatuor Libros sententiarum Commentaria* and a microfilmed copy of the third redaction of Durandus' *Commentaria in IV libros Sententiarum*, first printed in Venice, 1571²⁵. The second group of records from which this information has been drawn is their quodlibetals²⁶. While every effort has been made to cite critical editions, the relative sparsity of printed editions of our two Dominicans' works has impelled us to supplement those materials with information drawn from the collection of the Vatican Microfilm Library, Pius XII Library, St. Louis University.²⁷

METHODOLOGY

The procedure by which this inquiry was carried out involved the appropriation of traditional methodologies to ask new questions such as how the medieval Dominicans conceptualized their identity and their role in the

Church. Thus, [Chapter one](#) attempts to discern the manner in which the early Dominicans understood themselves, their mission within the Church and the role which they believed their educational and theological activities played in that calling. Such an understanding of how the Dominicans understood themselves facilitates a comprehension of why their intellectual tradition developed in the way that it did.

The historical and ideological contexts in which the Friar Preachers found themselves furthered this process of self-definition and is treated in the second chapter. This chapter delineates the intellectual trends within the Dominican Order which led to the ideological schism, especially the rising influence of Aristotle. In this chapter, the relative strengths and weaknesses of Aristotelianism within the Order are measured in three ways: first, by an examination of the changing curriculum in Dominican schools; second, by recourse to primary sources such as sermons and treatises in which Dominican theologians explicated their attitude towards Aristotle; and third, by assessing the extent to which Aristotelian concepts were actually employed by Dominican scholastics in their theological endeavors.

[Chapter three](#) locates the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain within the context of the intra-Dominican post-Thomas debates. In doing so, it distinguishes Natalis' and Durandus' conflict from those of their immediate predecessors. Having established the significance of the conflict over Durandus' teachings in the *eyes* of his brethren, the chapter then demonstrates the causal link between the controversies of Natalis and Durandus, on the one hand, and the legislative imposition of some of Thomas' writings in the Dominican schools, on the other.

Two historical facts underpin our approach in [Chapter four](#). First, the representational nature of the Dominican governmental structure negates the possibility that Thomism was imposed upon the friars by the Dominican hierarchy,—at least without the backing of a significant and vocal minority of Dominican lectors. Second, this support was not present in 1277, or even in 1290. Instead, the evidence indicates that an adherence to Thomas' teachings by the community of Dominican theologians grew as the controversies between Natalis and Durandus progressed. Thus, [Chapter four](#) undertakes a traditional exegetical investigation into the polemics exchanged by Natalis and Durandus to determine: first, what their arguments were; second: the significance which they accorded these disputes; and third, how they (and their fellow Dominicans) would have understood the relationship between the disputes and Aquinas' teachings.

Connecting the links established in previous chapters, [Chapter five](#) performs several functions within this dissertation. First, and foremost, it explicates the relationship between the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain, on the one hand and the *auctoritas*, or theological authority, of Thomas Aquinas within the Order of Preachers during the early

fourteenth century, on the other²⁸. But, in doing so, it also addresses other issues: the respective attitudes of Natalis and Durandus towards the person, the teachings and the *auctoritas* of Thomas Aquinas; the types of *auctoritas* which the Dominican hierarchy, led by Natalis, either denied or bestowed upon Thomas and, perhaps most importantly, the fundamental concerns which motivated Natalis, Durandus and their confreres first to join the post-1277 fray and then to resolve it in the way that they did.

The Dominican Order and Its Educational Structures

THE CONTROVERSIES BETWEEN HERVAEUS NATALIS AND DURANDUS OF St. Pourçain were not an isolated event: many people and institutions took part in the post-1277 debate over Thomism. Within the Dominican Order, these were members of the intellectual elites who, having scaled the educational ladder, taught in the schools, served as religious superiors and participated in the provincial and general chapters. The actions and attitudes of these friar preachers were, in turn, influenced by external institutions such as the papacy, the universities and the other mendicant orders. But also at play were intangible forces such as the gradual extension of the Dominican charism and an evolving self-understanding among the Dominicans as to their role within the Church.

Previous scholars have addressed some of the issues touched upon above. As a result, much that is here is not new. Several biographies of Dominic have met the canons of contemporary scholarship.¹ So too have many studies of the foundation and governmental structure of the Order.² But these works focus mainly on the Order's glory days during the early thirteenth century. With the exception of the more generic, traditional histories of the Order, the Dominican experience in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries has been left unstudied³. The Dominican educational system has been subjected to innumerable scholarly excavations, but these detail the skeletal structures of the schools and do not address the effects which they had on the Order.⁴

The relationship between the mendicant orders and the medieval universities has been a salient feature of most university histories.⁵ But these works, being closely confined to the universities, touch but lightly upon the Order of Preachers and provide only a partial perspective of the relationship between the two institutions. Before twenty years ago, in-depth studies of the topic have been restricted to the more controversial phases of the relationship, such as the secular-mendicant dispute⁶. More recent works have provided a new, highly nuanced portrait of the mendicant experience at the universities⁷.

Only one article addresses the question of the exact relationship between the Dominican Order and the universities⁸. Filling in these historiographical lacunae, the purpose of this chapter is twofold: to understand the early Dominicans as they understood themselves; and secondly, to examine how the educational structures which they erected furthered the process of their self-definition.

To achieve this aim, the chapter is divided into five sections, each of which examines a dimension of the Dominican charism. Contemplating the historical circumstances in which the Order of Preachers was founded, section 1 defines the Dominican mission and discusses the methodology by which it was achieved. Section 2 examines the process by which the Dominican charism was translated into an institution and the mechanisms adopted for its perpetuation. Rounding out the preliminary discussion of Dominican self-perception, section 3 describes the motivation and educational background of medieval Dominican recruits. Expanding the chapter's focus to include the concepts and practices by which the Friar Preachers realized their identity, section 4 details their educational institutions and the role which they were accorded in the Dominican ministry. Obversely, section 5 evaluates the Dominican experience at the universities and the effects which that experience had on the Dominicans' self-perception.

CHARISMATIC ORIGINS

The circumstances surrounding the origins of the mendicant orders are well known. By the early thirteenth century, the same rapid and intense socio-economic change which had sparked the rise of the towns had thrown the church into a profound crisis. The increases in industry, long-distance trade and urban growth endowed the townspeople with fresh pastoral needs ill-met by the institutional church. At the same time, the ideals of the Gregorian Reform had finally trickled down to the masses and were made manifest in the sphere of lay piety by a hearkening back to the poverty and evangelical spirit of the primitive church⁹. The combination of lay itinerant preachers evangelizing within the tradition of the *vita apostolica* and the diffusion of vernacular bibles provided the urban laity with alternative avenues to salvation which often by-passed the ecclesiastical structures of the Church. Uninspired by monastic spirituality and unimpressed by the secular clergy, increasing numbers of artisans and bourgeoisie tumbled into schism and heresy.

Of the multiple heterodoxies that appeared during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the dualist heresy of the Cathars (or Albigensiansim) stands out as having attained the widest following; and thus, as having posed the greatest threat to the Church.¹⁰ The Albigensians had many elements in common with other religious movements of the time including the exaltation of asceticism and the assertion of the authority of the *vita apostolica* against the apostolic

succession of the catholic clergy. Yet, unlike the Waldensians and others, the Albigensians diverged from the church in matters doctrinal, repudiating not only the catholic clergy but the Trinity and the Incarnation, and prayers to the saints and for the dead. The Albigensians also differed from other movements in their possession of an organized “church” hierarchy and a literate elite well versed in Scripture, although the *perfecti* acknowledged the authority of the New Testament but not the Old. While Catharism was generally strong in southern France and northern Italy, it found its strongest bastion in Languedoc where its adoption by the feudal baronage and the lower clergy led to the rise of a counter-church which had largely replaced its catholic counterpart in the lives and loyalties of the populace.¹¹

As part of a larger agenda designed to re-convert those who had lapsed and to prevent further leakage of the faithful, Innocent III [1198–1216] entrusted the task of a preaching crusade to the Cistercians.¹² Hampered by a myriad of unfavorable circumstances ranging from the inertia of the secular arm to the scandal engendered by prelatical wealth and display, the Cistercians experienced a series of disheartening failures. In 1208, while returning from a diplomatic mission with his bishop, Diego of Osma, Dominic Guzman [1170–1221], first encountered the papal legates.¹³ The two newcomers quickly sought and received permission to join the preaching effort.¹⁴ At the suggestion of Diego, the preachers first debated, then adopted “a combination of solid, well-argued Catholic doctrine and an apostolic lifestyle, modeled on the formula of Luke 10,” as the methodology most apt to re-convert the Cathars.¹⁵ Despite the death of Diego in 1207 and the chaos engendered by the disastrous Albigensian Crusade, Dominic continued preaching, at first alone, then with a small company of followers, in the tradition of the *vita apostolica*, until 1215.¹⁶ In that year, Dominic traveled to the Fourth Lateran Council and first petitioned Innocent III for papal approbation of the nascent Order.¹⁷ Later that year, Bishop Fulk of Toulouse issued his letter of approbation for the group and, from the legal point of view, transformed the voluntary association into a “diocesan institute of preachers.”¹⁸ More intriguing, perhaps, is the fact that the letter constituted episcopal recognition of the group’s purpose (“to eradicate depraved heresy, expel vices, teach the rule of faith and imbue morals,”) and methodology (“to go on foot, in evangelical poverty and to preach evangelical truth”).¹⁹ Honorius III provided papal approbation for the Order within diocesan boundaries in 1216 with the bull *Religiosam vitam*.²⁰ *Iustus petentiam*, issued on February 7, 1217, transferred the prescribed circumference of the Order’s mission from that of the diocese of Toulouse to that of the world.²¹ Later, Honorius III’s bull *Cum qui recipit prophetam* commissioned the Dominicans as confessors and thereby expanded the nature of the Order’s apostolate.²²

There is considerable debate among Dominican historians over Dominic’s original intention in founding the Order.²³ Evidence for the chief characteristics of the Order as envisioned by Dominic can be found in the

steady succession of papal bulls ensuring the Order's privileges which he secured between 1215 and his death in 1221, many of which were written by Dominic, himself.²⁴ *Gratiarum omnium*, promulgated by Honorius III in 1217, gave the Order its name and extended the scope of its mission to that of the universal Church.²⁵ *Gratiarum omnium* is specific in both its wording and intent: the Order of Preachers was constituted by its ecclesiastical commission to preach and their mandate to do so transcended diocesan boundaries. Upon promulgation of the bull, Dominic began to translate the idea of a universal order of preachers into reality by dispersing the brethren to Madrid, Bologna and Paris. Granted the use of portable altars in 1221, the friars were able to bypass the process of seeking permission to say Mass from the local bishop.²⁶ Yet, the acquisition of such privileges fostered the friars' dependency on the papacy in times of trouble.

The historical circumstances surrounding the foundation of the Order shaped what and how the Dominicans would preach. The two-fold task which faced the incipient Order during the formative years in Toulouse was the conversion of heretics and the re-enforcement of the faith of the catholic minority. In pursuing this goal, Dominic and his followers preached sermons, debated with the Catharist *perfecti*, wrote tracts, engaged in apologetics and instructed their audiences on the articles of faith and the sacraments.²⁷ The intellectual dimension of these activities is striking and not only provides a sharp contrast to the verbal exhortations which characterized the preaching of most evangelical movements of the time, but reveals the predominant instructive aspect of the Dominican concept of preaching.²⁸ In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the Dominicans would play a major role in transforming the art of preaching.²⁹

These same circumstances also served to differentiate the Order of Preachers from other evangelical movements of the time. First, in contrast to the lay origins of the Waldensians and the Franciscans, the Dominicans were from the outset a clerical order whose members saw themselves as operating well within the established framework of the ecclesiastical establishment. Because of canon 13, "*De novis religionibus prohibitis*," promulgated by the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), which decreed that no new religious orders were to be founded, Dominic and his early followers were forced to adopt the Augustinian Rule in lieu of writing their own.³⁰ Thus, the Order of Preachers was not technically a new religious institution, but rather a new branch of the "ecclesiastically acceptable" canons regular.³¹ Moreover, the early Dominicans regarded themselves as such and did not bother to change their self-designation in the *Constitutions* from *canonici* to *clerici* until the General Chapter of 1249.

Secondly, the clerical status of the Dominicans, in conjunction with their formative experiences in Toulouse and the traditions of the Augustinian canons, did much to influence the *vita apostolica*. The friar preachers merely pushed the idea to a more radical extreme than did their clerical

predecessors.³² Previous scholars have pointed out that the more widely representative Waldensians and Franciscans emphasized the *vita*, whereas the Dominicans emphasized the *apostolica* portion of Luke 10, in which Christ instructed his disciples before they set out.³³ The difference reflects a fundamental variation in tone and purpose. The early Franciscans sought to imitate the apostles in detail, viewing the *vita apostolica* as a means of attaining personal holiness. The first-generation Dominicans, on the other hand, adopted the *vita apostolica* in order to enhance the effectiveness of their preaching and took up preaching in order to answer a need in the Church.

The creation of the Order of Preachers signaled a fundamental shift in the approach of the Medieval Church to the *cura animarum*. Scholars have traditionally defined the ecclesiastical significance of the Dominicans, aside from that accorded to the mendicant orders in general, in terms of the history of preaching: bishops had been the ordinary *ex officio* preachers throughout the Middle Ages and the institution of an order of preachers was a radical departure from that tradition. Preaching by clerics in the twelfth century was scarce: the spiritual shepherding of the laity was largely confined to the administration of the sacraments.³⁴ In contrast, the ministry of the Dominican Order was so focused upon preaching that it has often been characterized as unsacerdotal. The Dominican approach to pastoral ministry is rooted in the historical context in which the Order developed. Preaching was at the core of the twelfth-century evangelical awakening; by 1215, the *cura animarum*, could not, realistically, be undertaken without it.³⁵

TRANSLATION INTO AN INSTITUTION

As part of the process of receiving ecclesiastical recognition of and approbation for their ministry, the early Dominicans encrypted their *raison d'être*, as well as the methodology by which it was to be achieved, into their *Constitutions*. The basic structure of the *Constitutions of the Order of Preachers* underwent a number of successive changes during the formative years of the Order.³⁶ The *Consuetudines*, written by Dominic and adopted by the brethren in 1216, was comprised of the *Rule of St. Augustine* and supplementary statutes, or customs, adapted from the *Constitutions of Premontré*.³⁷ This appropriation of the *Rule of St. Augustine* and excerpts of the *Constitution of Premontré* meant that the Dominicans retained many traditional monastic practices such as the choral recitation of the divine office, the communal observation silence, a daily chapter of faults and a penitential code. The first full version of the *Constitutions*, the *Institutions*, was adopted by the General Chapter of 1220.³⁸ The *Institutions* consisted for the *Consuetudines* and additional amendments which attempted to encode the apostolic portion of the Dominican charism. The most important of these was the adoption of strict mendicancy.³⁹ A third and final version of the primitive constitutions, the *Constitutiones*, was adopted in 1228. The *Constitutions* were

revised and codified by Raymond of Peñafort in 1241.⁴⁰ This last version was to remain the basic text until 1932.

Fundamentally a collection of rules and regulations of the Dominican Order, the *Constitutions of the Order of Preachers* is divided into two parts: the *Rule of St. Augustine* and a series of statutes and regulations enacted by the Dominican general chapters. Compiled around 1050, the *Rule of St. Augustine* is a collection of general precepts regarding the religious life drawn from Augustine's letters.⁴¹ Alone among the Dominican legal documents, the *Rule* was regarded as permanent and could not be altered.

By the mid-point of thirteenth century, many friars wished to distinguish themselves from the canons regular and pushed to have the Dominican *Constitutions* approved as the Dominican Rule. In response, the General Chapter of 1254 assigned the master general, Humbert of Romans, the task of writing a specifically Dominican commentary to the *Augustinian Rule*. But, jealous of their liberty and fearful that the pope would alter the text of the *Constitutions*, the capitular fathers refused to consider an appeal to the papacy for approbation. The decision not to acquire papal ratification of the *Constitutions* had two consequences. First, any *constitutio*, or statute, contained in the *Constitutions*, could be modified, changed or deleted by the collective mandate of three successive general chapters.⁴² During the medieval period, the constitutions were altered almost every year.⁴³ Secondly, the Dominicans continued to pronounce their vows, "secundum Regulam beati Augustini et Institutiones fratrum Praedicatorum."⁴⁴

The first-generation Dominicans knew what they wanted their Order to be. More importantly, they possessed the education and know-how required to accomplish their goal. Dominic, himself, was highly educated for the time and seems to have chosen consciously among the canonical traditions to which he had been exposed.⁴⁵ In addition, the general chapters of 1220 and 1221 were each held at Bologna and were heavily influenced by the relatively large contingent of canon lawyers present.⁴⁶ By 1228, it is possible to discern a tendency to elect to office and to representation those friars who possessed the qualifications and prestige derived from university training.

The first redactions of the *Constitutions of the Order of Preachers* thus provide a striking portrait of what the early Dominicans wanted the Order to be. The Dominican Order was to be, "for the sake of preaching and the salvation of souls."⁴⁷ Friars were to be called by the name of friar preachers and no other.⁴⁸ The Dominican conventual experience may have been heavily imbued with the monastic ethos, but the early Dominicans regarded the monastic observance within the priories as a necessary aid to preaching. The *Constitutions* granted religious superiors a great deal of latitude in granting friars dispensations from any monastic practice which interfered with either preaching or studying. The predominance of monastic themes was limited to life inside the priory: Dominican life outside of the convent was to be characterized by the *vita apostolica*.

As indicated in the *Constitutions*, the Dominican governmental structure is three-tiered; allowing for the governance of the Order at the general, provincial and conventual levels. Influenced by the principles of collegiality and subsidiarity, each level of Dominican government is ruled by a chapter and a religious official.⁴⁹ Comprised of elected representatives, the chapters supreme executive, legislative and judicial authority.⁵⁰ In the *Constitutions*, the general chapters are portrayed as being primarily concerned with the correction, removal and election of the Master Generals. In reality, however, the capitular members' chief preoccupation was constitutional modification. In addition, they also issued ordinances, admonitions and prohibitions to deal with matters which were either too minor or too immediate to merit constitutional change. The purpose and activities of the provincial and conventual chapters paralleled that of the general chapters.⁵¹ The purpose and activities of the provincial chapters paralleled that of the general chapters. In contrast, the *Constitutions* depict conventual chapters as the setting for the chapter of faults.

The day-to-day running of the Order of Preachers was entrusted to the master general.⁵² Prior provincials and priors governed the Order within the microcosms of their provinces or priories. Dominican superiors were responsible for the spiritual welfare of the friars under their authority and for orchestrating the Order's relations with the local nobility, the ecclesiastical hierarchy and other religious orders. Officials governed according to capitular prescription and were subject to the authority of the chapters immediately above them.

Some scholars have argued that, in practice, the government of the Order or Preachers was increasingly dominated by religious officials in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.⁵³ This is particularly true of the master generals and provincial priors. However, Dominican superiors never possessed the absolute power of monastic prelates. For one thing, the obedience of a friar preacher to his superior was that "of a subject to law and holders of office."⁵⁴ Moreover, the power of Dominican superiors was further diluted in that the friar preachers viewed transgressions against the Order's laws and *Constitutions* to be faults but not sins.⁵⁵ In addition, chapters annually investigated religious officials and had the power to absolve (or remove) them from office. For example, the *Constitutions* stated that the master general could be deposed for heresy or criminal activity.⁵⁶ Later capitular legislation sought to curb the power of the master generals and the provincial priors. For instance, the General Chapter of 1236 legislated that neither the master general nor the provincial priors had the right to change or bypass capitular legislation unless they could show special cause.⁵⁷ Beginning in 1254, the master general was required to prostrate himself before the diffinitors, perform the *venia*, hear the accusations that had been leveled against him and accept his penance.⁵⁸

A concern for uniformity was a predominant leitmotif in Dominican legislation. Two instruments served to ensure that the triad of Dominican

administrations worked in unison. First, chapters and officials were integrated into an intricate network designed to collect and disseminate information. Convents were required to send reports to provincial chapters. Provincial *acta* were immediately forwarded to the general chapters.⁵⁹ Because of the sheer volume of incoming paperwork, the general chapters often legislated on the format of the provincial reports.⁶⁰ In 1255, an exasperated general chapter ordered that the reports be kept brief and succinct.⁶¹ An equally important concern of the general chapters was that constitutional amendments were disseminated and universally observed. Copies of constitutional *acta* were given to the diffinitors, visitors appointed by the general chapters and to the master general. Copies were also *sent to* visitors appointed by the provincial chapters.⁶² Priors were also required to keep copies of the Order's privileges and papal bulls concerning the Order.⁶³

Secondly, the Dominicans sent friars on visitations to ensure that capitular legislation was implemented. Visitors were appointed by both general and provincial chapters. Visitors appointed by the general chapters possessed the right to correct the excesses of priors and other friars.⁶⁴ Visitors who failed either to keep to their appointed rounds or to submit the required reports were subjected to heavy penances.⁶⁵ Master generals and prior provincials also served as visitors. Because he was expected to spend the majority of his time in visitations, the master general possessed no fixed residence.⁶⁶

The mobility necessitated by the Order's apostolic charism also contributed to the uniformity of Dominican practices and a cohesive Dominican self-perception. In contrast to the communal identity which resulted from the monastic leitmotif of *stabilitas*, the friars identified themselves primarily as members of the universal Order of Friar Preachers. Few Dominicans remained in the same priory for the duration of their professed lives. Novices were sent to other priories for instruction on the religious life.⁶⁷ After the novitiate, a friar's life was punctuated by periods in the *studia*, transfers, assignments and reappointments. This is not to say that all relations between friars from different priories or provinces were harmonious. The reluctance of the Oxford convent to assume full financial responsibility for its *studia generalia* was at least partly inspired by an incipient nationalism.⁶⁸ More dramatically, a group of German friars was rebuked in 1296 for harassing their Hungarian brethren.⁶⁹

But the conflict between Dominicans paled in comparison to that between the friar preachers and those outside the Order. The diffinitors were especially zealous in guarding against possible encroachments upon the Order's independence from outsiders. Appeals to outside authorities were strictly prohibited. Friars were not allowed to show capitular *acta* to outsiders.⁷⁰ Nor were they to attempt to procure benefices or appointments from princes, prelates or magnates.⁷¹ The 1234 injunction which forbade the friars to "speak rudely about the Franciscans either among themselves or with others" and "to refrain from passing on vicious gossip about them" was but the first of many

efforts to stem the rising tide of rivalry between the two Orders at the grass roots level.⁷² Loyalty to fellow Dominicans often superseded that to the papacy. Arnold of Prato, a capitular diffinitor, was accused of composing irreverent songs about the papal legates responsible for the deposition of his master general, Munio Zaporra.⁷³

The Dominican administrative structure constituted a watershed in the history of Church institutions and readily became the institutional archetype of later religious orders.⁷⁴ In sharp contrast to previous religious orders, the Dominicans did achieve a government which was both centralized and representative to a degree not previously realized.⁷⁵ And while recent scholarship suggests that the wishes of the *fratres communes*, or the rank and file of the Order, did not hold much sway in the decision-making at the highest level, contemporary evidence argues that the friars preachers believed they had a right to be heard. Heavy penances were imposed on friars who attended either the general or provincial chapters without the permission of their superiors.⁷⁶ The *acta* of the general and provincial chapters bear witness to innumerable friars who, yearly, defied prohibition and made the trek to the general and provincial chapters to voice their complaints and offer their opinions.⁷⁷

EARLY GROWTH

A period of intense numerical growth and geographical expansion in the early thirteenth century reinforced the Dominican administrative structure and was to have a profound impact upon the Dominican identity.⁷⁸ Although the rate of Dominican vocations never matched that of the Franciscans, the Order's early growth is still impressive. In 1215, the nascent order was comprised of Dominic and 16 companions. In 1221, there were approximately 300 friar preachers distributed among 30 convents.⁷⁹ Between 1237 and 1277, the Order's membership doubled from about 4,000 to 8,000 friars. At its zenith in 1337, scholars have estimated that there were approximately 12,000 friar preachers.

The growth and expansion of the Order was strictly regulated. General chapters regulated the establishment of provinces and delineated their territorial boundaries.⁸⁰ At the General Chapter of 1228, the number of Dominican provinces was increased to 12. In 1337, there were 18 provinces. Provincial chapters determined the foundation, membership and, if necessary, dissolution of convents.⁸¹ Not surprisingly, most medieval foundations occurred before 1275.⁸² Except for the 10 houses in the two provinces of Greece and Palestine, Dominican priories were limited to western Europe. Dominican foundations were most heavily concentrated in France, Germany and Italy. Most convents were founded in cities which possessed the potential of material support for the mendicant communities. Due to the paucity of available sites, priories were often located at the city gates or near the town

walls.

One reason that the Dominicans possessed fewer convents than did the Franciscans was that they preferred larger foundations. The *Constitutiones* decreed that no priory was to be established without a prior, a lector and at least twelve friars.⁸³ The ideal size of a Dominican convent was 100 or more friars so that the convent could sustain a high rate of apostolic absenteeism and still maintain its monastic practices.⁸⁴ Priorities which maintained *studia generalia* or which were located in densely populated cities generally exceeded 100 members. The convent of St. Jacques in Paris normally housed between 250 and 300 friars. Most convents, however, probably averaged between 25 to 50 friars.

During the thirteenth century, the Order of Preachers zealously pursued policies designed to enhance its growth. Yet it was also discriminating in its recruitment. The reception of re-converted heretics and those of illegitimate birth was strongly discouraged. Although the Dominicans adopted the Cistercian practice of accepting peasants and members of the urban poor as *conversi* or laybrothers, literacy was a prerequisite for those wishing to become professed friars.⁸⁵ Thus, like the Franciscans, the Dominicans generally drew their recruits largely from the more affluent classes, most notably from the merchant and professional classes, as well as the lesser nobility.⁸⁶ There was, however, some regional variation. In Germany, for instance, a considerable proportion of Dominicans came from the nobility.⁸⁷ Age-wise, Dominican recruits tended to fall into two categories: those who were already ordained as priests and teens who would require education and training within the Order.⁸⁸ Of the two groups, the Dominicans preferred the latter.

Other religious orders provided the early Dominicans with a tempting preserve from which to draw vocations. However, the general chapters soon took strong steps to discourage this practice due to the interminable legal complications and inter-order squabbles which it generated. By 1244, the acceptance of a member of another religious order required the special dispensation from the provincial chapter.⁸⁹ Papal interdict forbade the acceptance of Augustinians.⁹⁰ The entry of members of the Cistercians, Humiliati and Carmelites required a special dispensation from the master general.⁹¹ The continual bickering between the Franciscans and the Dominicans caused Gregory IV to issue *Quos vos in Christo* which forbade transfers between the two orders.⁹² The poaching was not one-sided. Dominicans often sought to transfer to other orders. Not surprisingly, the Dominicans sought to discourage its members from leaving and often looked to the papacy for aid in curtailing such transfers.⁹³ The Order would allow friars to leave after the imposition of a penance.⁹⁴ Once a friar preacher left for another order, he was not allowed to maintain contact with his former brethren.⁹⁵

A much more concerted effort was maintained to draw vocations from

among the university populations. Dominic, himself, established the precedent of founding priories in university cities for that very purpose. Jordan of Saxony, Dominic's immediate successor, alternately gave Lenten sermons at Paris and Bologna specifically designed to promote vocations.⁹⁶ Interestingly enough, Jordan found more novices among bachelors and masters of the arts than among theologians and canonists.⁹⁷ While recruits from the universities constituted only a small percentage of Dominican vocations considered as whole, they provided the Dominicans with an intellectual elite from which to draw its officers, lectors and inquisitors.⁹⁸

Reasons for entering the Order of Preachers varied. The strong intellectual dimension of the Order's charism influenced many of the friars drawn from the universities.⁹⁹ The evangelical element of the *vita apostolica* stimulated others. Inspiring sermons and charismatic preachers prompted yet others. Thus, a sermon by Reginald of Orleans prompted Jordan of Saxony to seek admission. Most Dominican applicants, however, were motivated by more traditional concerns such as the desire to do penance or to flee from the world.¹⁰⁰

STUDY, SCHOOLS, AND SCHOLARS

Constituted by its mandate to preach, the Order of Preachers was, from its origins, an *ordo praedicatorum*. But while the Dominicans, like other mendicants, preached in the sense of instructing their audiences in *Christianitas* (i.e., "in Christian living and practice"), they also preached upon matters of doctrine and faith.¹⁰¹ This need to create an active, educated elite within the clergy, capable of understanding and explaining doctrine led the friars to interpret the phrase *ordo praedicatorum* as the equivalent of an *ordo doctorum*.¹⁰² This etymological equation, in conjunction with the other analogous terms of self-reference employed by the friars, gave rise to their notion of the Order as the guiding light of the Church.¹⁰³

The practical necessity of study for the realization of the Order's charism was recognized by the early Dominicans. Humbert of Romans, Master General from 1254 to 1277, wrote that, "study is not the end of the Order, but it is an utmost necessity to that end, which is preaching and laboring for the salvation of souls, for without study, we can do neither."¹⁰⁴ Similarly, the *Constitutions*, in the section entitled "*De studentibus*" not only justifies study on the basis that it helps friars achieve the Dominican ideal, but argued that it was necessary if the friars were to instruct others.¹⁰⁵

From the first days of preaching in Languedoc, Dominic was concerned that all of his followers receive a solid formation in moral theology and catechesis.¹⁰⁶ The acts of Dominic's canonization reveal that he was constantly urging his early followers to study Scripture.¹⁰⁷ Moreover, as is well known, Dominic and his *socii* studied theology under Alexander Stavensby at the cathedral school of Toulouse during the Order's formative

years.¹⁰⁸ What is not so well known, however, is that books were among the first items purchased by the little group with the tithe money granted them by Fulks for their support.¹⁰⁹

In the years following papal approbation, the actions of Dominic and his co-architects of the Order's constitutional make-up demonstrate the continued concern for the friars' education. First, priories were deliberately founded in university cities with the dual intention of educating the friars and of fostering vocations among the students and faculty. Secondly, the leitmotif of study is interwoven into the *Constitutions*, and thus throughout the Dominican identity. The capitular diffinitors of 1216 lay the groundwork by erecting a network of dispensations by which friars could be excused from choir and other duties for reasons of study. For instance, priors were granted the power to postpone or eliminate entirely a chapter of faults if it interfered with the friars' education.¹¹⁰ Similarly, the canonical office was to be recited "*breviter et succincte*" so as not to impede study.¹¹¹ The diffinitors of 1216 also introduced a new genre of faults: henceforward, it would be a fault for the brethren to mistreat their books, to sleep during lectures, to disrupt lectures, or to read forbidden books.¹¹² Negligence in teaching, studying or the copying of manuscripts were considered serious transgressions.¹¹³

The precedent set by the diffinitors of 1216 was further developed by their immediate successors. The capitular diffinitors of 1220 granted superiors the power to dispense students from duties which might interfere with their studies and mandated that every convent designate a friar to serve as "master of students."¹¹⁴ In 1235, an act was promulgated that demanded that confessors be instructed before hearing confessions.¹¹⁵ The following year, a statute was added to the *Constitutions* which mandated that preachers be instructed and examined before being sent out to preach.¹¹⁶

The most fruitful of their actions, however, was the erection of the Dominican school system. The primary building blocks which comprised the Dominicans' graduated hierarchy of schools were: the priory schools, the provincial schools and the *studia generalia*. Utilitarian in form and intent, the sole objective of the Dominican educational system was to provide the vast majority of the friars preachers with the theological training necessary for their day-to-day ministry. Thus, the Dominican novitiate was designed to immerse the novice in the Dominican way of life, not to educate him in grammar or the arts.¹¹⁷ In fact, only the more promising novices were only allowed to proceed to the *studium artium* and then only after two or three years of 'proving' themselves in the religious life.¹¹⁸ Preferring to cast their nets among the *magistri* and students of the arts, the Dominicans did not, as a practice, recruit from among the *insufficientia*.¹¹⁹ Even after the Order lowered the age of admission to fifteen, candidates were expected to have already acquired the basics in *grammatica*.¹²⁰ Conventual priors were held responsible for the instruction of the uneducated youths whom they admitted.¹²¹ Thus, unlike their brother mendicant orders, the friar preachers

had little need to found *studia grammaticalia* and only did so in the Spanish province.¹²²

The earliest, and most basic, unit within the Dominican educational system was the priory school. Because the *Constitutions* legislated that no priory be founded without a prior, a lector and at least twelve friars, every Dominican priory possessed its own self-contained school of theology.¹²³ Moreover, each priory school was monitored by a *magister studentium*, whose many duties included hearing recitations, holding disputations, correcting mistakes and nominating the more promising friars for further education.¹²⁴ Each and every friar living at any given Dominican convent was required to attend the priory school classes and to take part in the exercises.¹²⁵ Thus, priory school classes were remarkably inclusive, containing not only the *fratres communes* but religious officials such as priors and provincials, as well as students from the advanced Dominican *schola*, including those assigned to the Order's *studia generalia*.

As is true of the curriculum of the other Dominican schools, that of the priory schools evolved somewhat during the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.¹²⁶ Yet, by the middle of the thirteenth century, the curricular configuration of the priory *schola* (and, indeed, of all the Order's *studia*) consisted of daily lectures, disputations and *repetitiones*. Two cycles of daily lectures, the *lectiones ordinarias* and the *lectiones sententiarum*, served as the curricular pillars of the priory schools.¹²⁷ The *lectiones ordinarias* were meant to provide Dominicans with the essential tools they would need for preaching; namely, a grounding in Scripture and a model of Scriptural exposition. Thus, these morning classes consisted of lectors "reading" the Bible *ad litteram* and explaining the Scriptural passage in question within the context of Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica*. In contrast, the *lectiones sententiarum*, or the lectures on Lombard's *Sentences*, were meant to provide the friars with a grounding in orthodox doctrine. Reflecting the practice of the Parisian course, the *lectiones sententiarum* were given within the context of a gloss.

Dominican conventual education was not limited to the formal confines of priory *schola*. Rather, it was supplemented by other dimensions of the Dominicans' daily regimen; namely, the collations, repetitions and disputations. With regard to collations (*collationes*), this was done in a formal manner, such as the Dominican practice of holding biweekly *collationes*. Although originally adopted from the monastic practice of the same name, the Dominicans developed a variety of collations, each of which served a specific and pragmatic purpose.¹²⁸ The most pertinent of these, for our purposes, are academic *collationes* which served to re-enforce what the brethren had already learned in the schools, expose them to moral theology and to test the students before advancing them to a more advanced school.¹²⁹ For instance, in 1313, the general chapter at Metz not only ordered that all students in all schools were to go to all conventual classes, disputations and *repetitiones*, but mandated that the brethren should utilize their spare time in *collationes* or

private study.¹³⁰

Other less formal avenues of education were also encouraged. The General Chapter of 1259 ordered that friars living in convents without lectors occupy themselves with private readings.¹³¹ Humbert of Romans encouraged the less-educated friars to spend their spare time copying and studying the sermons of their more proficient brethren.¹³² Technical manuals, reference works and other pastoral tools were also available for individual study. Neither the priory schools, nor, to an even greater extent, the informal conventual education of the friars would have been possible if it were not for the priory libraries which contained such works.¹³³

Between the priory school and the *studium generale*, the Dominicans experimented with several types of provincial schools. Some of these were restricted to certain provinces. One such instance are the language schools (which taught Arabic, Hebrew and Greek) founded in Spain in the late thirteenth century for future Dominican missionaries.¹³⁴ Others, such as the *studium Bibliae*, were universal but short-lived, disappearing in the mid-fourteenth century.¹³⁵ For our purposes, however, the fundamental units of provincial-level education were the *studium artium*, the *studium naturalium* and the *studium particulare theologiae* (also known as the *studium solmne*).

The combined courses of the *studium artium* and the *studium naturalium* were roughly the equivalent of the arts course at the northern universities.¹³⁶ The courses of both schools normally lasted between two to three years. The Dominican *studium artium* was a two-year course in “logic and logic alone,” and, as such, was comprised of a series of ‘authoritative texts,’ including Aristotle’s *Prior* and *Posterior Analytics*.¹³⁷ The lector of *studia artium* must have attended the *studia naturalia* for two years.¹³⁸ The curriculum of the *studium naturalium* consisted of Aristotle’s *Ethics* and *Metaphysics*, as well as other known “scientific” works. Neither of these *studia* remained housed in the same priory for the duration of its existence. Instead, both were rotated from convent to convent within the province in order to distribute the burden and expense of maintaining the extern students. Because the responsibility for organizing, regulating and running these two *studia* were placed in the hands of the provincial priors and their chapters, the friars’ experience within these two schools varied from province to province.¹³⁹

Although its name conjures up the geographical boundaries which separate one province from another, the *studia particularia* were designated as such because of their “partial or particular” curriculum which was fundamentally a two-year course on the Lombard’s *Sentences*.¹⁴⁰ After the early fourteenth century several treatises by Thomas Aquinas were added to the curriculum. Although, the *studium particulare* did not offer magisterial lectures on Scripture, its curriculum did parallel that of the *studium generale* in other ways: both taught the *Sentences* through principal as well as cursory lectures; held disputations and, as of 1314, taught moral philosophy. To ensure that the two schools were mutually complementary, the curriculum and the standards

of both schools were coordinated and administered by the general chapters. Lectors for the *studia particularia* were appointed by the master general who also approved the appointments of students to the *studium generale*.

At the pinnacle of the Dominican school system was the *studium generale*. By definition, Dominican *studia generalia* differed from their secular counterparts. Throughout the first part of the thirteenth century, the term *studium generale* was used to denote schools which possessed at least one of the superior faculties or which had been blessed with papal or imperial recognition.¹⁴¹ In the late thirteenth century, the term was most commonly used to refer to a scholastic community whose members enjoy a specific set of recognized privileges, the most notable of which were the dispensations for clerical students from residing in their benefices and the bestowal of the coveted *licentia ubique docendi*.

Within the network of Dominican *schola*, the *studia generalia* differed from the lower-level schools on three levels. First, the *studia generalia* had an Orderwide enrollment whereas students for the other *schola* were drawn from strictly defined geographical areas.¹⁴² Secondly, the *studia generalia* possessed permanent locations. Third, they were administered centrally. A *studium generale* could only be established by order of the general chapter. All of the *studia generalia* were under the direct supervision of the master general.¹⁴³ Student enrollment at the *studia generalia* was strictly regulated according to a quota system maintained by the general chapters. As the number of *studia generalia* increased, so too did the complexity of the quota system.¹⁴⁴

Appropriating the term but not its signification, the Dominicans employed the expression to mean a *studia* designated by its general chapter to serve friars drawn from throughout the universal Order rather than from within one of its provincial or conventual territories.¹⁴⁵ Just as the Dominican *studia generalia* differed from their secular counterparts in terms of purpose, so too did they deviate from the curricular model for the advanced study of theology established by the University of Paris. Friars entered the baccalaureate program only after completing the curriculum of the lower schools plus one to two years of preliminary theological study at the *studia generalia*. As was the case with the secular theology schools, the Dominican *studia generalia* were restricted to the study of advanced theology. But the Parisian course was three-pronged; resting on a set of ordinary lectures on Scripture by the regent master which in turn was supplemented by two courses of cursory lectures (one each on the *Sentences* and on Scriptures) given by two bachelors (known respectively as the *cursor Sententiarum*; and *cursor biblicus*). In contrast, while a Dominican regent master was also assisted by two bachelors, his senior bachelor traditionally served as the master of students (*magister studentium*) and his lectures were supplemented only by those of the first-year bachelor, who served as *cursor Sententiarum*.

Intriguingly, the selection, supervision and correction of Dominican students, moreover, provided the Order with its most persistent problem. The

general chapters repeatedly admonished provincials and their vicars not to send “rogues” or inept scholars to the *studia generalia*.¹⁴⁶ Instead, provincials were instructed to seek out only those students who were mature and possessed good study habits.¹⁴⁷ Many students were discipline problems. Indeed, the general chapters were constantly bemoaning the turbulence caused by rebellious students at the *studia generalia*.¹⁴⁸ In many cases, fights broke out between local students and foreign “externs.”¹⁴⁹ In addition, some of the extracurricular activities of the friar students often caused scandals, thereby exacerbating the school’s woes. In 1302, students in the *studia generalia* were prohibited from visiting beguines or other “notable” women and were instructed instead to concentrate their attention on their studies.¹⁵⁰ Some discipline problems were scholastic in nature. Many students were disciplined for neglecting their theological studies in order to attend lectures and disputations in the more popular arts course.

The maintenance of the *studia generalia* necessitated immense administrative and financial adjustments. Yet, curiously, the Dominicans, themselves, seem to have never questioned either their possession of the *studia generalia* or the effects which the studia would have on the Order. Administering the *studia generalia* was an expensive proposition. Moreover, begging for alms, even in the larger cities, could not sustain communities of 200 to 300 men, let alone the costs of buildings, books and supplies. Often patrons were found. Louis IX financed the building of the refectory and dormitory at St. Jacques.¹⁵¹ More often, however, provincial chapters were forced to impose taxes on their convents. Despite the Order’s best efforts, however, most *studia generalia* were in a constant state of poverty. The general chapters twice had to order the provincial chapters to raise money to help the *studia generalia*.¹⁵²

In addition to the Dominican *studia generalia* located at the universities, the Order also maintained a *studium generale* at the papal court.¹⁵³ Reflecting the historically close relationship between the papacy and the Dominican Order, the friar preachers staffed the pontifical *studium generale*.¹⁵⁴ Founded in 1245 by Innocent IV, the *studium generale* served the purpose of continuing the education of members of the curia and other clergy either visiting or residing at the papal court. The regent master of the pontifical *studium* was called the *magister in sacri palii*. This position was usually held by a Dominican who was appointed by the pope. William of Peter Godin became the first *magister in sacri palii* in 1306.¹⁵⁵ He was succeeded by Durandus of St. Pourçain in 1317.¹⁵⁶

Although the duties of the *magister in sacri palii* originally correlated to the duties of regent master of theology, the influence of the office steadily increased throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The *magister* was often employed as a papal legate or sent on diplomatic missions. Throughout the fourteenth century, at least, the *magister* served as a papal counselor and theologian.¹⁵⁷

In the long-term, the Dominican educational organization proved elastic enough to expand or contract according to demand.¹⁵⁸ In the short-term, however, the friar who wished to pursue his studies faced considerable obstacles. At each subsequent stage, there were fewer schools and fewer slots within them. By 1300, scholars have estimated that out of approximately 10,000 Dominicans, 500 were students and half of these were destined to teach in the *studia*.¹⁵⁹ As the friar students scaled the ladder, however, they were accorded more and more privileges. For example, the diffinitors which comprised the Roman provincial chapter of 1276 dispensed their theology students, but not their logic students, from all choir duties save prime, compline and the conventual Mass.¹⁶⁰ Such perks were rationed and distributed according to the level of study attained by the students, thus further exacerbating the class distinctions between friars of varying degrees of educational attainment.

There were far fewer *magistri*. Even after having served as a *magister studentium*, a friar may not have received the license or incepted. The Order's dire need for lectors in the lower *studia* siphoned off many promising candidates. For all practical purposes, the friar who had received his license was the equivalent to a master of theology. Inception was often postponed indefinitely due to the expense of the customary feasts and gift-giving.¹⁶¹ To receive his degree, the candidate had only to perform a number of formal academic acts known as inception. After inception, the new master entered into a two-year period of regency. The Dominican Order required that its regent masters remain at the *studium generale* until they had been replaced by a fellow Dominican. Although a regent master of theology might hold his chair indefinitely, Dominican regent masters were usually quickly re-assigned in order to make room for the next year's newly graduated master. Once a friar incepted as a *magister*, however, he enjoyed a status and a set of privileges above and beyond even that of the master general.

Dominican success in education was recognized at the time and contributed to the Order's status and expansion. Dominican thinkers were often the leading lights of the medieval universities and their fame did reflect back upon their Order. Dominican schools were open to non-Dominicans and partially compensated for the scarcity of educational avenues open to clerics. Bishops and heads of religious houses often asked the Order for friars to lecture in cathedral schools and abbeys. In 1221, the bishop of Metz requested that a Dominican convent be founded within his diocese so that his clergy could benefit from their lectures.¹⁶² Later, in 1246, the archbishop of Rheims petitioned Innocent IV for a Dominican foundation so that the clergy of his see might benefit from the Dominican priory schools.¹⁶³ But what is all too often forgotten is that while some friar preachers elucidated the finer points of scholasticism in the *studia generalia*, others taught catechesis and the formation of letters to the literate and semi-literate members of the urban and rural populations.¹⁶⁴ And yet others still performed the task for which the whole system had been erected: the preparation of friars for lives of preaching,

hearing confessions and, at times, serving as inquisitors.

It is an almost monomaniacal concern with this goal which comes shining through the ecclesiastical documents. Education in the fundamentals was to be a continuing concern, inspiring provincials to write handbooks for beginning preachers and confessors.¹⁶⁵ Moreover, at no juncture was the Dominican educational apparatus re-structured so as to produce brilliant academicians. But time and time again, provincial and general capitular *acta* overhauled this curriculum or that so as to better form the *iuvenes*. Even the famed *Ratio studiorum*, so long (and wrongly) hailed as the Dominicans' final capitulation to Aristotelianism, was fundamentally geared towards reforming the theological preparation of the *fratres communes*.¹⁶⁶ Although Dominican education was always but a means of achieving the ultimate end of saving souls, teaching rapidly became one of the defining motifs of the Dominican identity.

By the second generation, the Dominicans regarded teaching, considered in its broadest sense, as an integral part of their charism. Jordan of Saxony, Dominic's immediate successor as Master General, defined the Dominican charism as, "to live an upright life, to learn and to teach."¹⁶⁷ Like the majority of his brethren, Aquinas regarded teaching as an activity particularly suited to the mendicants.¹⁶⁸ In some instances, teaching proved to be one of the definitive themes of a friar's life in religion. For example, Aquinas chose teaching as the topic of his *principium* lecture, defended Dominican educational activities during the secular-mendicant disputes and then later developed his ideas concerning teaching and teachers in his *De Veritate*.¹⁶⁹

FRIAR PREACHERS AT THE UNIVERSITIES

A plethora of stumbling blocks render the precise relationship between the Order of Preachers and the universities; or even that between the Dominican *studia generalia* and the universities, nearly impossible to delineate with any real precision. First, contrary to popular belief, not all Dominican *studia generalia* were located at universities. For instance, the Dominican *studium generale* at Cologne, from whence Albert the Great first achieved fame, not only preceded the university, but endowed the city with the prerequisite reputation for learning needed to draw the faculty which would eventually comprise the magisterial guild. Somewhat differently, the Dominican *studium generale* at Bologna existed side-by-side with but was not attached to the secular university.¹⁷⁰ Secondly, the Dominicans did not consider all of their *studia* which were located at universities to be *studia generalia*: hence, their *studia* at Toulouse and Cambridge were not *studia generalia* due to constitutional and legislative restrictions. Yet, despite all of the obstacles, it is possible to determine some aspects of the Dominican experience at the medieval universities.

Prompted by a desire to save souls, foster vocations and educate his more

promising friars, Dominic's decision to disperse his friars to Paris and Bologna in 1216 was to have a palpable effect on the early history and identity of his Order. In 1220, John of St. Albans, a regent master of theology at Paris, began to teach the friars in theology at the convent of St. Jacques.¹⁷¹ Once the friars were studying under a regent master, they became, ipso facto, students within the university.¹⁷² When John of St. Giles, already a master, joined the Order in 1230, the existence of the Dominican *studium generale* became official according to the customs of the University of Paris; for licensed *magistri* were at liberty to conduct their own lectures.¹⁷³ From 1230 on, both chairs were perpetually handed down within the Order from Dominican to Dominican; one chair being reserved for masters of the French province, the other held by masters from outside of France. Thus, St. Jacques, incorporated into the University of Paris in 1220, was the first *studium generalium* to be founded by the Dominican Order.¹⁷⁴ In 1248, the General Chapter ordered that four other *studia generalia* be founded: Cologne, Oxford, Montpellier and Bologna.

Ambivalence characterized the Dominicans' attitude towards the universities at which their own *studia generalia* were located. Despite their predilection for study, the Dominicans never regarded the rarified atmosphere of the universities as morally beneficial to their friars. Indeed, friars who remained at the schools overly long were to be severely punished.¹⁷⁵ Similarly, while the many privileges that the papacy had bestowed upon the Order witnessed to the importance which they attached to their position within the universities, the Dominicans also took pains to avoid assimilation into the university community, preferring to utilize the services of the university without involving itself in their internal affairs. For example, the Order refused to allow its members to take the arts course in order to protect the friars from the "alleged profanities which marred the university course."¹⁷⁶ The Dominicans' disassociation with the arts course also enabled the friars to avoid oaths of allegiance to the arts faculty and rector. In fact, because the Dominicans were exempted from the arts course and were restricted from studying any of the "higher" disciplines save theology, the theological faculty was the only department within any given university with which the Order had official dealings. The degree of Dominican insularity was high, but not complete. For instance, Dominican *magistri* participated and voted in theological faculty meetings.

The experience of the Order of Preachers at the universities varied according to the constitutional model of the *studium generale* in question. The inter-institutional relationship between the Dominican Order and the student-run *studia generalia* was fundamentally harmonious. These *studia* included Bologna, which served as the exemplar for universities which had originated as student guilds; and its imitators in Italy, such as Padua; as well as those northern *studia generalia* which shared its specialty in law. The reason for this relative lack of conflict was simply that the Dominicans never impinged upon the students' spheres of interest. In Bologna, itself, the teaching of theology

was left largely to the mendicant orders until its own theological faculty was established in 1364. The mendicants also comprised the theological faculties within the *studium generale* of other Italian universities until the middle of the fourteenth century.

In contrast, the relationship between the Dominican Order and the magisterial-run universities which specialized in theology (namely Paris, Oxford and Cambridge), has often been depicted in terms of the “secular-mendicant disputes.” Although there were periods during which the relationship between the Order of Preachers and the University of Paris was harmonious; most notably before 1230 and, to a lesser extent, after 1321, the period between those years was often characterized by intense conflict between these two groups.

Originating as a dispute over the mendicants’ refusal to join the magisterial strike in 1229, the secular-mendicant disputes were soon transformed into a war over the legitimacy of the mendicants’ *raison d’être* by William of St. Amour.¹⁷⁷ In 1254, provoked, perhaps, by Gerard di San Donnino’s *Introductorius in Evangelium aeternum*, Innocent IV promulgated the bull *Etsi animarum* which rescinded all of the privileges which he and his predecessors had previously granted the mendicant orders.¹⁷⁸ In 1255, Alexander IV rescinded *Etsi animarum* and restored the mendicants’ privileges with the promulgation of *Quasi lignum vitae*.¹⁷⁹ One year later, Alexander IV condemned William of St. Amour’s *Tractatus de periculis novissimorum temporum*.¹⁸⁰ Although the disputes slowly died down, anti-mendicant feeling remained widespread. During the reign of Urban IV [1261–1264], the mendicant *studia*, in practice, became restricted to their own Orders.¹⁸¹

Although inflamed by the constitutional status of the mendicants within the universities, the secular-mendicant quarrels, at the most basic level, reflected two conflicting ecclesiologies. The attacks of William of St. Amour and the seculars on the mendicants championed a predominantly episcopal concept of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, concerned primarily with the issue of pastoral jurisdiction, especially the authority to preach and to hear confessions. In contrast, the existence of the friars was, in part, the result of a newer perception of a centralized Church ruled by the papacy which could grant similar authority to the mendicant orders as well as exempt them from episcopal jurisdiction.

As the most “intellectual” of the mendicant orders, the Dominicans bore the brunt of the fighting.¹⁸² In the early 1250s, when the disputes had reached their climax, friar preachers in the streets of Paris were greeted with, “the sounds of barking dogs, roaring bears, hissing serpents and obscenities”; and were pelted with filthy rushes, mud and stones.¹⁸³ *Etsi animarum* was construed by the friar preachers as having placed the Order’s very existence in peril. After the Franciscans made a separate peace with the University in 1253, the Dominicans, for all intents and purposes, stood alone. Although the Dominicans fought aggressively to retain their privileges and to regain their

former status, their *modus operandi* in doing so was conservative and their policy was primarily one of appeasement. The friar preachers were instructed to admonish the populace to honor their prelates and to frequent their parish churches.¹⁸⁴ Friars were prohibited from going to funerals at the houses of seculars lest it cause scandal.¹⁸⁵ They were also prohibited from contending with prelates about the power of mendicants to hear confessions or to preach.¹⁸⁶

The secular-mendicant disputes had a profound impact on the Dominican Order, both immediate and long-term. In the short-run, the Dominicans became hypersensitive to the possibility of heresy among its friars. Having faced the threat of extinction because of the heretical writings of the Franciscan Gerard of San Borgo Donnino, the general chapter of 1254 adopted a strict policy of censorship to ensure that none of the writings of its own members would provoke similar reaction.¹⁸⁷ In this context, the general chapter of 1256 enjoined the friars to delete from their books any articles which had been condemned by the Parisian bishop and masters.¹⁸⁸ The secular-mendicant disputes also reinforced traditional Dominican independence and hostility towards outsiders. More importantly, perhaps, the secular-mendicant disputes forced the Dominicans to articulate ideas about their fundamental identity which previously had been only implicit. Thus, the secular-mendicant disputes sparked the genesis of an apologetical tradition which would, in turn, eventually define the Dominican intellectual and spiritual traditions.

When the Dominicans originally entered into the universities, they regarded education as an ancillary activity which would provide them with the necessary tools by which they could save souls. They did not realize that their relationship with the universities possessed an intrinsic dynamism which would ultimately transform their perception of themselves and their charism. In 1215, the Dominicans were a small band of itinerant preachers. In 1300, the maintenance of their position within the universities was an unquestioned institutional and communal commitment. The Dominicans, moreover, became increasingly viewed by themselves and by others as the most “intellectual” of religious orders.

The Dominican Intellectual Tradition

IN ANY GIVEN ERA, THERE ARE CERTAIN OVERRIDING PROBLEMS THAT determine the context of intellectual life. Throughout the thirteenth century, this problem was posed by the transmission of a hitherto-unknown mass of Aristotelian philosophy filtered into the West via the works of Islamic and Jewish translators and commentators. As is well known, historians have traditionally utilized the attitudes toward and employment of Aristotle to classify the intellectual orientations of medieval individuals and groups; usually into the three categories of Augustinians, Averroists, and those, like Thomas Aquinas, who incorporated elements of both the Augustinian tradition and the Aristotelian corpus into a single synthesis. Indeed, it is within this framework that scholars have identified ‘schools of thought,’ and, most particularly, the ‘Dominican school.’

For the most part, medievalists have been content to refer to a “Dominican school” without bothering to ascertain whether or not there was, in reality, a school of thought specific to the Order of Preachers prior to 1277.¹ In fact, the question of Dominican specificity has been the subject of heated debate. Several well-known Dominican scholars have asserted a Dominican predisposition towards Aristotelianism, pinpointing its causation in the Dominican governmental structure or spirituality.² Others, equally well known, have refuted these arguments, maintaining that the term, if applied to the Order’s early history, is a ghost entry, referring readers to a phenomenon that did not, as yet, exist.³ More recently, one contemporary has argued that the Dominicans were, from their origins, of a particularly conservative cast and thus, predisposed to be more wary of Aristotelianism than were their non-Dominican peers.⁴ However beguiling the subject may be, this chapter does not address the question of Dominican specificity, in and of itself. Instead, reaching beyond these questions to one more directly related to our thesis, this chapter explores how the Dominicans, themselves, viewed the Aristotelian corpus; its assimilation into their educational system and its place in the intellectual activities of their elites.

To achieve this aim, this chapter is divided into four parts, each of which

treats a dimension of the Dominican scholastic experience. After a preliminary discussion of scholastic terms and concepts, the first section relates the manner in which the friar preachers first appropriated scholasticism and then manipulated it to achieve their ends. The second segment dissects the early Dominicans' attitudes towards Aristotle and then addresses the manner in which Aristotle was assimilated into first the theology of Dominican lectors and then into Dominican educational structures. Providing the backdrop to the Dominican conflict, the third section will piece together the connectedness between Thomas Aquinas, the Condemnations of 1277 and the various non-Dominican ecclesiastical reactions to the man and the event in the late thirteenth century. Setting the immediate institutional context for the controversies, the fourth section discusses the reactions of the Dominican hierarchy to the Condemnations of 1277 and its aftermath.

THE FRIAR PREACHERS AND THE METHODOLOGY OF THE SCHOOLS

When the Dominicans first entered the universities in 1216, they “fully accepted the world of professional theology” which they encountered, especially that which was encapsulated in the culture of the University of Paris.⁵ This unquestioning acceptance of the *modus parisiensis* impacted the Order of Preachers on several levels. First, it determined the basic parameters of their educational structures and the conceptual underpinnings to those schools. For example, the Friar Preachers subscribed, perhaps unconsciously, to the divisions of knowledge entailed by the *quadrivium* and the *trivium*; to grammar and logic as foundations to the “higher” discipline of theology and the opinions that the theological course should be based on *Sacred Scripture* and Peter the Lombard's *Sentences*. But the friar preachers' appropriation of the *modus parisiensis* also influenced the manner in which they practiced their intellectual activities. From the beginning, medieval Dominicans applied the scholastic method to their pedagogy and to their reasoning about theological and philosophical matters; and wrote in scholastic genres. In other words, medieval Dominicans were, for all intents and purposes, scholastics. But what, exactly, did this entail?

SCHOLASTICISM: DEFINITION AND TERMINOLOGY

Although *scholasticus* (*scholastici*, *scholares*) originally designated a “lecturer who taught one of the liberal arts in a recognized school,” the meaning of the term has expanded with time. Historians have traditionally used the term to denote the broad category of men who studied, taught, or wrote first within the context of the monastic and cathedral schools of the eleventh and twelfth centuries such as Bec, Laon, Chartres, Saint Victor and Notre Dame de Paris;

and later in the universities of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries such as Paris and Oxford.⁶ This is fine, as far as it goes. But scholasticism was not restricted to the schools and universities. Instead, it was disseminated throughout the clerical estate. For example, monasteries often hired friars or other university-trained clerics to educate their monks in scholastic theology.⁷ Thus, for the purposes of this dissertation, scholastics were those persons who used the scholastic method.

Simply put, the scholastic method, or scholasticism, was the manner in which the scholastics studied, taught and wrote during the late Middle Ages. It had little or nothing to do with the subject at hand: scholasticism was employed within the disciplines of theology, philosophy, law; not to mention the subsidiary disciplines. Neither was it bound to a specific set of beliefs. At assorted times during the Middle Ages, scholasticism was employed by various groups to advance or beat back the causes of Aristotelianism, Augustinianism, Thomism, Scotism and Aegidism, to name but a few. It was merely the manner in which scholastics reasoned about the issues before them.

Fundamentally, scholasticism was the application of some form of the Aristotelian dialectic, usually in the form of the *quaestio*, to the traditional monastic method of teaching, the *lectio*.⁸ The *lectio* entailed both the public reading and explanation of an authoritative text by the instructor within the classroom (hence the terms *lector* and lecture).⁹ Interestingly enough, the scholastics, themselves, described the scholastic method as a *modus inveniendi*, a means of inquiring after, or more colorfully, as a *modus perquendi*, a manner of searching thoroughly, the authoritative texts for a truth which was already present. In fact, medievals first adopted the scholastic method precisely because it was universally accepted as the most effective *modus discendi*, or method of teaching.¹⁰ The purpose of the *lectio* was not the discovery of new, or hitherto-unknown knowledge, but the transmission and assimilation of the *corpus auctoritatum*, that is of Christian and pagan authoritative texts. The *quaestio*, in turn, normally followed a formulaic pattern and was comprised of: the question proper, arguments pro, the *sed contra* (or arguments *contra*), and finally, the resolution of the problem which addressed both the pro and con arguments (usually called the *responsio*, the *solutio* or the *determinatio*).¹¹ Authoritative texts were used to support arguments *pro* and *contra*. During the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, the *quaestio* was not a separate entity of the *lectio*, but rather one of its integral components.¹²

As the scholastics mastered the basics of the Aristotelian dialectic during the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries, they adapted the *quaestio* to meet more and more intellectual and pedagogical needs. Evolving out of the *quaestio* in the twelfth century, the *disputatio* was a formal exercise in which a master solved, or determined, a *quaestio*. In contrast to the lecture, the *disputatio* dealt with individual topics instead of specific texts.¹³ Thus, in contrast to the *lectio* (which was concerned the explication of the meaning of the text), the *disputatio* had as its main task the application of text's meaning.¹⁴ There were

two types of disputations: the *quaestio disputata* (when the subject matter was predetermined) and *quaestio de quolibet* (when no restrictions were put upon the subject matter being debated).¹⁵

In addition to the formal academic lectures and *disputationes* performed by the *magistri*, the scholastic method was also practiced by the baccalaureate students in their *exercitia*, *repetitiones* and *resumptiones*. The pedagogical purpose of these practices is striking. Usually taking place in the afternoons or early evenings, these were exercises, like the *collationes* practiced by the Dominicans, which provided students the chance both to rehearse texts already memorized and to improve their technique and skill in public debate.

Reflecting the range of their intellectual interests and activities, the scholastics produced texts formatted within a plethora of scholastic literary genres. The vast majority of these are pedagogical in nature.¹⁶ Thus, the two most familiar scholastic literary genres are the glosses or commentaries, and the *summa*. Arranged topically and divided into articles, the *summae* (of which Aquinas' *Summa theologiae* is the most famous) were comprehensive manuals covering the whole of a topic and, although not specifically designed for classroom use, was geared for the instruction of beginners.¹⁷ In general, however, textbooks were generally either authoritative texts or, in the tradition of Abelard's *Sic et Non*, collections of writings extracted from authoritative texts.¹⁸ The best-known collection of authoritative texts is, of course, Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. Other records document what was taught by individual masters in their lectures and disputations in the classroom. Examples of these include the *ordinationes*, *reportationes*, examination *compendia* and the *quodlibeta*, which later served as the preferred format for scholastic polemical tracts.¹⁹ Finally, the scholastic method was utilized in pastoral aids by the mendicants and other religious, as witnessed by the expansive presence of the *quaestio* format in thirteenth – and fourteenth-century sermons and the profusion of the *Summae confessorum* during the thirteenth century, works which replaced the earlier *Libri poenitentiales*.²⁰

Just as “scholasticism” refers to the manner in which scholastics discussed philosophical truths, so too does scholastic theology designate the way in which scholastics reasoned about theological issues. Because it involved matters of faith and salvation, medievals placed theology at the pinnacle of their hierarchy of the sciences. Indeed, the importance which medievals accorded theology far out-measured that of philosophy and the other sciences. Medievals conceptualized theological study as a *via*, or a way, which led the practitioner not only to knowledge of God but along the way to actually approach God.²¹ For the schoolmen, as for their predecessors, the correct or incorrect arguments and conclusions of a theologian could influence the salvation or damnation of his audience.

Medievals employed a number of terms to signify theology, including *sacra doctrina*, *studium sacrae scripturae*, *sacra pagina* and *divina pagina*.²² Each of the terms listed above originally indicated a form of biblical exegesis.²³ Not

surprisingly, then, theology before the twelfth century was primarily a hermeneutic activity and the primary documents it produced were scriptural commentaries in which interlinear and marginal annotations explicated the text.²⁴

The shift from traditional, or monastic, to scholastic theology came in (or rather, more slowly, throughout) the twelfth century, with first the introduction of and then the extensive application of *quaestiones* to biblical exegesis.²⁵ Implicit in this change of method were more fundamental adjustments in attitude and premise. In contrast to their monastic forebears, the scholastics sought knowledge in addition to spiritual growth, grasping what truths they could by reasoning about the texts and then testing their hypothesis in the give-and-take of the public forums of the classroom and disputation. For the monks, the sole aim of the *lectio divina* was spiritual edification, received passively as the different senses buried in the text were sifted out by the means of reading and meditation. For the scholastics, the text was a platform from which to jump into “theological discussions set out in dialectic form.”²⁶ By the thirteenth century, the shift in focus from the text to the *propositio* was complete and *theologia* covered “the whole range of topics of faith and order.”²⁷

This shift in theological method mirrored a transformation in the role and status of the exegete. The *theologi*, or theologians, first emerged as a separate and professionalized class in the early thirteenth century.²⁸ Like *magistri* in other disciplines, the primary duties of theologians were to preach, teach and dispute.²⁹ Thus, as was the case of most scholastics, the professional lives of theologians were lived out primarily within their classrooms.³⁰ As theologians took on the additional roles, such as those of counselors to kings and prelates, participants in counsel and arbitrators in political and religious disputes, their immediate impact upon medieval society began to extend far beyond the walls of the classroom.³¹ Less spectacular, but no less real was the amplification of the power wielded by regular theologians as class divisions within the mendicant orders crystalized and education became the *sine qua non* not only for perks but religious office within their respective orders. In part, the authority of both secular and regular theologians rested upon the dual pillars of the authority accorded to all *magistri* and the additional prestige accorded them as members of theological faculties.³²

Although the *theologi*, as a class, often brandished a great deal of power and influence, their intellectual activities were subject to a number of limitations. Beginning with the trials of Peter Abelard and Gilbert of Poitiers, there already “lurked the eminence grise of church authority.”³³ Among these, the most immediate were the papacy, the episcopacy and the universities faculties, themselves.³⁴ In most cases of suspected heresy, theologians “policed” their own.³⁵ The authority wielded by each of the aforementioned institutions was measurable, indeed concrete. In actuality, however, the locus and scope of theological endeavor was formed and limited by a far less tangible force;

namely, that of magisterial authority, or the common opinions of the community of theological masters.³⁶ Thus, when Aquinas debated John Peckham over the doctrine of the unity of form, he submitted his own opinions to the Parisian theological faculty for examination and criticism.³⁷

In addition to the ecclesiastical and university authorities which regulated the intellectual activities of all scholastics, regular theologians were subjected to additional controls. Obviously these included the restrictions laid down by religious superiors and legislation enacted by provincial and general chapters.³⁸ In addition, the intellectual activities of the mendicants were not only constrained by the rather general magisterial authority mentioned above, but were also bound by the more limited theological parameters determined by the consensus of the doctors within their own order. Hence, John Peter Olivi, for example, was always reluctant to openly contradict the commonly held views of his Franciscan brethren.³⁹

The main conduits by which the scholastic method initially entered into the Order were the Dominican *magistri* and their *studia generalia*. The short regencies of the *magistri* and the continual re-shuffling of students assigned to study; and the rapid turnover of conventual lectors facilitated the assimilation of the scholastic method among the friars exposed to higher education. But neither scholasticism nor its mastery was restricted to the world of university-educated friars. Barthélemy of Breganza never progressed further than the provincial-level *studia* in Lombardy yet later became the first master of theology appointed to the pontifical *studium*.⁴⁰ Neither was it restricted to Dominican elites. Each and every member of the Order was required to attend the conventual schools. In those priory schools, friars were not only required to attend classes taught in the scholastic method by lectors either bound for or returning from sojourns in the higher *studia*, but they were also required to take part in the formal and informal exercises, *repetitiones* and *collationes*.⁴¹ From the first day a friar set foot into his priory, he was trained to reason in scholastic terms; and he studied the most fundamental aspects of his vocation, namely preaching and the hearing of confessions, in works written within scholastic literary genres. It is not surprising, therefore, that highly technical and intricately nuanced scholastic terms (and the concepts which those terms signified) not only comprised the *lingua franca* of the Dominican *magistri* but worked their way into the daily conversations of the *fratri communes*. By the middle of the thirteenth century, scholasticism permeated the Order of Preachers to a far greater extent than any other medieval institution save that of the universities.

The effects of the friar preachers' daily use of the scholastic method upon the Dominican ethos was magnified and shaped by several of the leitmotifs which dominated the Order's early history. First, there is the relationship between the Dominicans' inquisitorial activities and their concern with education. Anecdotal and coincidental evidence supporting a Dominican predisposition towards orthodoxy abound. 'Hearings' on the theological orthodoxy (or

suspected heterodoxy) of Parisian theologians took place in the Dominican convent of St. Jacques.⁴² That there are only two instances in which the writings of Dominican *magistri* were investigated or censured before 1277 witnesses to the fact that the friar preachers had a much cleaner slate in the public arena than did either their mendicant or secular rivals. Moreover, while the Dominicans' near-monopoly on inquisitorial offices might be explained by the same circumstances which surrounded the Order's genesis; namely, the lack of highly educated secular clerics capable of performing this task; this does not take into account the Dominicans' perceived correlation between orthodoxy and education. In practice, the friar preachers used instructive sermons and other forms of pedagogy to cure the souls of those afflicted with heresy. Implicit in their ministry, as well as their writings, was a belief that education could cure or prevent heterodoxy.

Second, the Dominicans were singularly blessed with a centralized administration which enabled the Order to direct its members' talents. Many of the Dominicans' most notable works were originally requested by either the master general or by the general or provincial chapters. Thus, Aquinas wrote his *Summa contra gentiles* at the request of Raymond of Peñafort.⁴³ Similarly, Natalis wrote his *Defensa Divi Sancti Thomae* at the bequest of Aylmar of Piacenza. Religious superiors were able to harness the talents not only of individuals but of groups. Thus, Vincent of Beauvais was able to call upon a team of "*fratres ceteri*" to perform the research required for his *Opus universale de statu principalis*.⁴⁴ Similarly, a team of Dominican scholars, under the leadership of Hugh of St. Cher produced the first Bible concordance.⁴⁵ Under the auspices of the General Chapter of 1236 and the leadership of Hugh of St. Cher, yet another team of friars, comprised of the few Dominicans who knew Hebrew and Greek, compiled the first biblical *correctoria*, lists of variants from the standard St. Jacques Bible, which, due to the Order's concern with uniformity, was to become a standard study aid for Dominican students.⁴⁶ Third, this advantage of a centralized leadership enabled Dominican superiors to oversee works and projects which promoted Dominican doctrinal positions. Thus, collections of Eckhart's sermons were redacted, edited and revised so as to reflect the party line.⁴⁷

Other dimensions of the Dominican ethos strengthened the absorption of the scholastic method, as well as the ideas and concepts which were encapsulated in the scholastic disputes and tracts, into the daily lives of the friar preachers. Of these, the most notable is the Dominicans' traditional preoccupation with the written word. In many cases, the value which the Dominicans attached to books was essentially practical. Hence, the injunction of the General Chapter of 1233 that the books of deceased friars were not to be sold outside or inside of the Order but distributed among their living brethren.⁴⁸ Moreover, this concern with texts is evident not only in the measures undertaken to procure books but in the obvious delight expressed by priors and provincials upon their acquisition. Despite the exorbitant price, Jean

of Torino, the provincial of Lombardy, authorized the lector at the convent in Turin to buy sixty-nine books as the foundation of his convent's library. Reflecting their value, each of the manuscripts was painstakingly catalogued in detail.⁴⁹ Similarly, the titles and conditions of each and every one of the forty-six manuscripts donated to the Dominican convent at Pisa by frater Poyno's father were also annotated at length by the conventual scribe.⁵⁰ Also illustrative of the Dominicans' captivation with texts are the care with which they preserved their books and the detailed concern which they expressed over the nature and scope of their library collections.⁵¹

Always malleable in the face of the Order's immediate needs, medieval Dominican intellectual activity was almost ceaselessly practical in nature. Not only were most works written by medieval Dominicans particularly geared towards Dominican audiences, but most were also aimed at advancing specific objectives identified by the Dominican hierarchy. Geared towards facilitating the education of the *fratres communes*, most Dominican compositions were primarily pedagogical in nature. Thus, Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*, explanatory in nature and arranged topically for easy reference, originated as a handbook for beginners. Almost as often, however, Dominican intellectual efforts resulted in penitential handbooks, collections of sermons, and other pastoral aids expressly intended to aid the brethren in their ministries.

Intriguingly, medieval Dominicans were aware, perhaps even self-conscious, of their obsession with the usefulness of their works. Tracking the theme of utility through the prologues to works by such diverse Dominican authors as Vincent of Beauvais, Humbert of Romans, Gerard of Frachet, Thomas of Cantimpré, Roland of Cremona, Hugh Ripelin of Strasbourg, and Albert the Great, one recent article argues that Dominican scholastic texts were almost always designed to meet specifically Dominican needs.⁵² Often, Dominican intellectual efforts were deliberately designed in such a way as to meet exigencies in addition of that of the text's designated purpose. For example, most Dominican compilations not only display an awareness of the lacunae in most conventual library collections but include extracts and passages specifically designed to fill those gaps.⁵³ Other efforts were designed to facilitate the imposition of uniformity throughout the Order. Among the most notable of these was the homogenization of diverse liturgical practices into a single Dominican liturgy.⁵⁴ Others, such as the plethora of *De viri illustribus Ordinis Praedicatorum* produced throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, provided the *fratres communes* with exemplars on which to model their own behavior and attitudes, thereby reinforcing a common identity.

Examples of the manner in which the medieval Dominicans appropriated and channeled the scholastic method to achieve their aims could be generated *ad infinitum*. What is relevant, however, is that this habit of transfiguring the intellectual practices and genres of the universities so as to further the Order's *raison d'être* was paradigmatic and would characterize their attitude towards

ARISTOTLE AMONG THE FRIAR PREACHERS

When the first seven friar preachers walked into Paris in 1217, their arrival went largely unnoticed: the clerical community was preoccupied with more substantial issues; the largest being the crisis generated by the successive waves of Aristotelian texts then flooding the universities. Other works have thoroughly detailed the scholastics' initial inability to reconcile "the corpus of doctrines and knowledge associated with Aristotle and his Arabian and Jewish commentators" with their own heavily neo-Platonic Augustinianism. The reactions of the Church and the universities to the misuse of Aristotelian principles and methodology by a small cadre of schoolmen have been similarly well covered. For our purposes here, two points are of concern. First, a number of hindrances stood in the way of Aristotle's entry into the Order of Preachers, not least of which were the surfeit of canonical prohibitions against the public reading of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* and other books on natural philosophy.⁵⁵ Second, these proscriptions were not as clear-cut as they might first seem. A manifestation of the growing tension between the arts and theological faculties, the purpose of the Parisian university statutes of 1210 and 1215 was to prevent further encroachments by the artists into natural philosophy, ethics and metaphysics—areas which the *theologi* regarded as their own preserve. Thus the statutes merely prohibited professors from publicly lecturing on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* and works on natural philosophy.⁵⁶ Reading here was used in the sense of lecturing: private consultation was not prohibited nor were the *magistri* prohibited from consulting the works for their own edification.

As was the case with the scholastic method, itself, while the Dominicans assimilated many of the attitudes toward Aristotle current within scholasticism upon their entry into the universities; they also modified and channeled those attitudes to meet their own needs. For instance, the first Dominicans incorporated the canonical prohibitions just mentioned into their primitive *Constitutions* and subsequently replicated them in their capitular legislation.⁵⁷ However, data contained in the Dominican documentation permitted conflicting interpretations as to what exactly the first Dominicans intended by the prohibitions. First, the most recent scholarly treatments agree that the friars were not simply adopting the university statutes, but citing precedent, namely, the relevant decrees found in Gratian. Secondly, unlike many of the ecclesiastical and university statutes, the Dominicans' *Constitutiones antiquae* make no specific mention of Aristotle.⁵⁸ Third, considered cumulatively, Dominican legislation against 'forbidden studies' were much more comprehensive than were those applicable in the universities or in any other ecclesiastical institution.⁵⁹ Yet, these prohibitions, in turn were offset by the Dominican habit of granting dispensations for the pursuit of studies or any

other activity which would aid the Order in achieving its mission.

Although the practice of granting dispensations began in 1228 and accelerated under Humbert of Romans, it reached its acme under the generalship of Johannes Teutonicus [d.1253].⁶⁰ Most of the dispensations granted by Teutonicus, however, were to provinces, not individuals. For example, in the 1240s, Teutonicus allowed the Provence province to experiment with schools in logic. This more liberal orientation had two intriguing components to it. First, in the 1240s, provinces were granted greater freedom in deciding their policies regarding the philosophical studies of their friars. Secondly, this new freedom seems to have been, for the most part, limited to logic and moral philosophy.⁶¹ Thus, in 1243, frater Boniface was ordered to turn his philosophy books into his prior.⁶² The following year, the Roman diffinitors extended the mandate to all the friars within the province, emphasizing that they would not get their books back unless they obtained the required “special license” from their provincial.⁶³

Aristotle’s works were first officially integrated into the Dominican core curriculum in 1259, when the Friar Preachers adopted a new *Ratio studiorum*.⁶⁴ The decision to overhaul the curriculum of the Dominicans began in 1258 (or earlier), when Humbert of Romans, in conjunction with the general chapter, appointed a committee to draft a list of recommendations for the reform of the Dominican schools.⁶⁵ Headed by Albert the Great, the committee also included Thomas Aquinas, Peter of Tarentaise, Florence of Hesden and Bonhomme of Brittany.⁶⁶ Paradigmatic of the Dominican tradition of appointing its best and brightest to draft policy and design curricula, the identity of the committee members is significant, for their views did not represent those held by the majority of lectors. The *Ratio studiorum* was first officially adopted by the General Chapter of 1259 and ratified by the following two general chapters.

Although the *Ratio studiorum* reinforced innumerable reforms which had been addressed by earlier chapters, it also added a number of innovations to the Dominican educational system. For instance, it provided the lectors of the *studia solempne* with bachelors, formally ordered the institution of *repetitiones* and began the practice of *collationes*.⁶⁷ Most important of all, the ratification of the *Ratio studiorum* resulted in the mandate that each and every province within the Order found an arts school.⁶⁸

No doubt many events and concerns propelled the formation of the *Ratio studiorum*. One of the most obvious possible causes for this shift may have been the new curricular requirements inaugurated at the University of Paris in 1255 which appropriated Aristotelian natural philosophy and metaphysics for the core curriculum of its arts course.⁶⁹ But on another level, the *Ratio studiorum* no doubt reflected the committee members’ recognition that, if the friar preachers were to master theology, as it was evolving within the professional milieus of Paris and Oxford, they would need a thorough grounding in logic.

Provincial reactions to the “pro-Aristotelian” injunctions and admonitions of the general chapters were diverse, varying from province to province. Whether because of intellectual principle or fear of the cost, most provinces were reluctant to establish *studia artium*, prompting successive general chapters to *reiterate the* injunctions more and more forcefully. In 1265, the General Chapter at Montpellier ordered all provinces without a *studium artium* to make such instruction available to its members.⁷⁰ The General Chapter of 1261 forced the provinces of Spain, Rome, Poland, Hungary and Denmark to found one each. The province of Germany was ordered to establish three.⁷¹ Not all provinces were reluctant, of course. In 1269, the provincial chapter of Province published a series of ordinances for their *studia artium* which reveal an intense concern for the new school’s success.⁷²

This pattern of provincial diversity is equally applicable to the later appropriation of the *studia naturalia*. In 1262, Provence founded the first *studium naturarum*. Rome did not found one until 1288.⁷³ Prior to that year, the Roman province had maintained a proscriptive policy against education in philosophy. In 1305, the general chapter made it mandatory for each province to have a *studium naturarum*. By the beginning of the fourteenth century, however, even the most reluctant of provinces had embraced the philosophy curriculum and its role in the Order.

But if the Dominican attitudes toward assimilation of the Aristotelian corpus during the first half of the thirteenth century appear diverse and varied viewed through the prism of institutional history, our perception changes when we consider the writings of individual scholastics. To say that Dominicans before Albert the Great carried on a debate over Aristotelianism would be an overstatement. What is certain, however, is that prominent Dominican scholastics, on both sides of the issue, communicated their views and their concerns to the rest of their brethren in their sermons and spiritual writings. Thus, John of St. Giles warned the friars of St. Jacques against those who, “when they come to theology are not able to be parted from their science, as is clear in certain people, who, in theology, are not able to be separated from Aristotle, carrying as it were brass instead of gold, that is, philosophical questions and opinions.”⁷⁴ In another homily given in Paris in 1231, an anonymous friar lashed out at theologians who had appropriated bits and pieces of Aristotle, stating that they spoke in “points and lines,” thereby corrupting their theology.⁷⁵ Even Vincent of Beauvais, known for the liberal sprinkling of Hebrew and Arabic references throughout his works, questioned the appropriateness of Aristotle.⁷⁶ The wariness was not universal. A few lone voices, such as Humbert of Romans, did ring out in Aristotle’s support, albeit in a limited manner. As was usually the case, Humbert was in the minority.

Despite the prohibitions and the predominant attitudes of wariness, however, it is probable that philosophy was studied and perhaps even taught within the Order of Preachers from its origin, albeit on a small scale.⁷⁷ There is a great deal of evidence to support this view. First, a sizeable portion of the

early candidates to the Order were either students or masters of the arts. Humbert of Romans and Roland of Cremona are but two of the many Dominicans drawn from the pool of artists.⁷⁸ Albert the Great had studied the arts at both Bologna and Padua. Similarly, Thomas Aquinas was also trained in the arts, including Aristotle, under Master Martin (who covered grammar and logic) and Peter Ireland (who taught the natural sciences) between 1233 and 1239.⁷⁹ Considering the personality, teachings and stature of these masters, it is improbable that they ceased studying and teaching Aristotle upon entering the Order. In fact, in the cases of Roland of Cremona and Albert the Great, citations of Aristotle continue to appear in their texts throughout their working lives.

Secondly, provincial and general chapters made annual attempts to curb excessive philosophical study among its members. Needless to say, this legislation would not have been necessary unless at least some of the brethren were engaged in philosophy. Third, the Dominicans, themselves, developed guidelines for the extent to which the pursuit of philosophical knowledge by their members was acceptable.⁸⁰ In addition, historians have recently determined that a large part of medieval teaching occurred in the form of extraordinary lectures.⁸¹ It is entirely possible, therefore, that philosophical lectures within the Dominican schools did occur without leaving their imprint upon the records. Moreover, the Dominicans, unlike other religious orders, maintained a silent reading room apart from the hustle and bustle of the convent, so that it is feasible that at least some friars could and did study the forbidden books from early on.⁸²

But like the configuration at the end of a kaleidoscope just shaken, the historical truism is altered, almost imperceptibly, yet again when we turn to survey the extent to which Dominican scholastics before Aquinas employed Aristotelian methodology and concepts. Naturally, some account must be taken of the exact generation of the Dominican in question. Thus, John of St. Giles and Hugh of St. Cher appear ultra-conservative set next to the friar preachers of the following generation, but unusual when viewed in their own context. A number of Dominican scholastics, such as Robert Bacon, Richard Fishacre and Roland of Cremona, did use Aristotle in their works, but they did so within an Augustinian framework.⁸³ Indeed, most Dominicans prior to the early fourteenth century were thoroughly Augustinian in their outlook. Yet, Dominican and non-Dominican conservatives differed fundamentally in their attitudes towards their shared beliefs; for whereas Franciscans such as Pecham regarded Aristotelianism as “impious”; Dominicans such as Kilwardy viewed it as simply untrue.⁸⁴

Boundless in both his thirst for knowledge and his energy, Albert the Great was the first scholastic to tackle the whole of the Aristotelian corpus. Simon Tugwell has argued that Albert’s motivation in undertaking a commentary on the whole of Aristotle’s known works was “the need to show exactly what Aristotle had taught, at a time when some intellectuals were using Aristotle to

support plainly heretical positions.”⁸⁵ That may well be. Despite the intriguing possibilities which this interpretation implies, Albert himself justified the work by claiming that he was answering the questions of his brethren.⁸⁶ Yet, what is at issue here is not Albert’s motivation but the reception of his work by his fellow Dominicans. There is no doubt that Albert was highly regarded by his contemporaries, both in and out of the Dominican Order. Albert was called “the Great” during his own lifetime (an accolade which was not even bestowed upon Aquinas).⁸⁷ Even more pertinent, Albert used his chair at Cologne to teach a course on Aristotle’s *Ethics* in 1248; and was entrusted by Humbert of Romans with the task of drawing up the syllabus for the *studium naturarum* in 1262—all of which points to the fact that Albert’s Aristotelian adventures were sanctioned by the Dominican hierarchy.

Yet, as Yves Congar has pointed out, the fact remains that Albert’s use and conditional acceptance of Aristotle was the object of fierce opposition within the Dominican Order.⁸⁸ Although he was always ready to dispense with those Aristotelian elements which conflicted with Christianity, Albert defended the use of philosophy by contrasting such sophistication with the brute ignorance of his carping critics.⁸⁹ However one measures Albert’s influence on his Order, it did not take the form of wholehearted acceptance of the new use of philosophy.⁹⁰

Whether or not one includes Albert the Great, a consideration of Dominican intellectual tradition prior to Thomas Aquinas reveals several characteristics which differentiate the friar preachers from other non-Dominican scholastics. Although Aristotelian terms, concepts and quotations were appearing with increasing frequency on the pages of thirteenth-century scholastic texts, the trend was much more pronounced in works by Dominican authors. Second, Franciscan, Augustinian and secular authors at the mid-point of the thirteenth century cited *auctoritates* drawn from the twelfth-century *moderni*, such as Hugh and Richard of St. Victor, with more or less the same frequency and respect as had the two generations which preceded them. Thus, during the first half of the thirteenth century, the Dominican scholastics partially disengaged themselves, bit by bit, from the same Augustinian tradition which their non-Dominican confreres continued to re-affirm. Despite this overall trend, however, the friar preachers were not only not proponents of Aristotelianism (and never would be) but were decidedly suspicious of the doctrinal dangers which might be skulking within the plethora of badly translated texts on which they relied. It was in this milieu that Aquinas rose to prominence.

THOMAS AQUINAS, THE CONDEMNATIONS, AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES

Thomas Aquinas [1224–1274] is probably the most famous and momentous thinker in the history of the Dominican Order.⁹¹ Born to a noble family of

Lombard origin in Roccasecca, near Aquino, Aquinas was educated at the Benedictine monastery of Monte Cassino and later, following the invasion of Frederick II, at the University of Naples. In 1243, the year of his father's death, Thomas joined the Order of Preachers. After having been kidnaped and incarcerated for a year by his family, Aquinas proceeded to Paris. Between 1248 and 1252, he studied under Albert the Great at the *studium* in Cologne. From his departure for Paris in 1252 until his death in 1274, Thomas would play a role in each of the series of crises which shook his Order.

Although the significance of Aquinas' life and works for the Order of Preachers is immeasurable, it is possible to categorize the roles which he played in the Order. First, Thomas served as the Dominicans' primary apologist, defending the Order's commitment to higher education against the taunts of William de St. Amour during the secular-mendicant disputes, especially within the realm of theology, as well as the Dominican interpretation of religious poverty.⁹² As part of his research into and polemics on the subject of religious poverty, Aquinas criticized the writings of Joachim of Fiore, thereby exacerbating the tensions between the friars preachers and minors.⁹³ But to a far greater extent, Aquinas was an educator: most, if not all of his writings were written in order to teach. Yet, within the history books, Aquinas is regarded, first and foremost, as the thinker who "baptized" Aristotle. Or, to put it another way, Thomas has been remembered as the scholastic who, in creating his synthesis, reconciled reason and revelation. In reality, however, Thomas' appropriation and use of Aristotelian elements is much more complex than is commonly realized. To be fair, Aquinas does use Aristotelian tools, principles and concepts. But he uses them in such a way as to make Aristotle seem to have said things (e.g., there is only one God, the pure act of being) with which, had he but known, Aristotle, himself would have disagreed.

Medieval attitudes towards Aquinas and his teachings were mixed. He was respected as a thinker. In the 1260s and 1270s, the demand for Aquinas' works was so great that it served as the catalyst for the beginning of university stationers in Paris.⁹⁴ That he was widely read by the Parisian arts faculty has also been thoroughly documented. The attitude of Aquinas' non-Dominican contemporaries, however, is much more ambiguous. It is certain that he possessed a following among the artists at Paris.⁹⁵ Siger of Brabant was an avid reader of Aquinas' writings and would later be characterized as hypersensitive to Thomas' criticism of his own works.

On the other hand, it is equally certain that Aquinas left a large number of critics in his wake. As has already been pointed out, the majority of medieval thinkers regarded Aristotle and Aquinas' use of Aristotle as somehow "foreign" and uncongenial to their own, more traditionally Augustinian worldview.⁹⁶ Thus, the Dominican John Pecham, was openly hostile to Aquinas' teachings.⁹⁷ Many seculars disagreed with Aquinas' teachings. Henry of Ghent and Godfrey of Fontaines both attacked Aquinas' rendering of

theology as a science, in particular, his theory of the subalternation of science.⁹⁸ Most Franciscans opposed Thomas' teachings. During his regency (c. 1280–1284), Roger Marston is reported to have thundered against, “the *novitatum praesumptores*, the *theologi philosophantes*, the pelagians, and the like,” i.e., against Thomas and his early followers.⁹⁹ Incited, perhaps, by Aquinas' participation in the debate over mendicancy as well as his icy critiques of Joachim of Fiore, Peter John Olivi repeatedly attacked many of Thomas' teachings.¹⁰⁰

Fundamentally, the Condemnations of 1277 were the open eruption of long-simmering differences between traditional Augustinians, Thomas and his followers, and the more radical Aristotelians.¹⁰¹ Frustrated by the failure of the earlier Condemnations of 1270 to quell the activity of the Averroists, conservative theologians appealed to the Bishop of Paris. In 1277, Etienne Tempier appointed a commission of sixteen masters, including Henry of Ghent, to re-examine the “errors” current in the Arts faculty.¹⁰² The commission was also ordered to re-examine the writings of Giles of Rome and Thomas Aquinas. On March 7, 1277, Bishop Tempier condemned a list of 219 errors. Of these, 16 were (or were perceived to be) drawn from the writings of Thomas Aquinas. Eleven days later, on March 18, Peter Kilwardy, the Archbishop of Canterbury, condemned thirty errors in grammar, logic and natural philosophy.¹⁰³

The Condemnations of 1277, in conjunction with a series of related events, such as the silencing of Richard Knapwell and the investigation of Giles of Rome, injected the universities with an atmosphere of repression and cautious cynicism. The condemnations did not kill the debate between the neo-Augustinians and the early Thomists. But it did muffle free and open discussion of issues which vitally concerned both sides. Worse, it forced scholastics to argue points in which they did not believe and to adopt unreasonable theses. Forced to subscribe to the plurality of forms, Nicolas Trivet answered his objector that, “...since the archbishop did not tell us how to solve the difficulties against this view, neither will I tell you, lest I misrepresent him.”¹⁰⁴

Concurrent trends within the institutional Church influenced and were influenced by the steady progression of Thomism. Particularly relevant to the history of the Order of Preachers, however, is the extent to which the Augustinian-Thomist struggle exacerbated the growing rivalry between the mendicant orders. As early as 1284, John Peckham denied that his ratification of his predecessors' condemnations was rooted in an anti-Dominican prejudice, complained that certain garrulous Dominicans not only regarded Thomas' teachings as “the opinions of their order”, but had vowed to defend him against all comers.¹⁰⁵ The theological schism between the Franciscans and Dominicans has been well documented. So too have the doctrinal similarities between the Augustinians and Cistercians.¹⁰⁶ Less well known are the intimate corporate ties which bound the Carmelites to the Dominicans and no

doubt influenced the doctrines of both orders. Adherence to theological traditions may not have been predetermined by religious affiliation but charisms and corporate pride played a considerable role in the Augustinian-Thomist conflict. This is particularly true in the case of the *usus pauper* debates.¹⁰⁷ Thus, Olivi's defiant castigation of Aquinas' view on poverty and the nature of the religious life is as illustrative of the growing schism between the Franciscans and the Dominicans as of the Augustinian-Thomistic contest.¹⁰⁸

Perhaps the most ardent institutional support for the Condemnations came from the Dominicans' traditional rivals, the Franciscans. In 1279, William de la Mare, a Franciscan scholar, published a correction of Thomas writings.¹⁰⁹ In the *Correctorium Fratris Thomae*, de la Mare cited 117 excerpts taken from Aquinas' written works in which he differed from St. Augustine and St. Bonaventure.¹¹⁰ That same year, the Franciscan General Chapter forbade its members to defend theses contained in the Condemnations.¹¹¹ Three years later, in 1282, the Franciscan General Chapter forbade the dissemination of Thomas' *Summa* except among their "more intelligent" lecturers.¹¹² Even then, provincials were not to allow the dissemination of the *Summa* unless it was accompanied by a copy of William de la Mare's *Correctorium*. Ministers were to defend "sane" opinions.¹¹³ Intriguingly, the legislation was accompanied by further admonitions warning provincials against the dangers of the spread of heresy and the occult within the order, suggesting that Aquinas was not their only concern.¹¹⁴ The second redaction of the Franciscan Constitutions, promulgated in 1292, reaffirmed the Order's dedication to the defense of the Parisian Condemnations.¹¹⁵ Criticism of Aquinas and his teachings was not limited to the Franciscans. Many Augustinians and seculars joined in the frenzy of attacks. What is surprising, however, is the fact that they were joined by Dominicans who, rooted in twin traditions of Augustinianism and Dominican inquisitorial activity, believed strongly that Aquinas represented a radical breach with the Dominican intellectual tradition.

Emerging out of the religious maelstrom unleashed by the Condemnations of 1277, the primitive Thomists first began to come together as a school.¹¹⁶ Scholars have traditionally discerned the conception of the early Thomistic school in the defense of Aquinas against the charges of heresy flung by his detractors in the wake of the Condemnations. Yet this interpretation, in and of itself, fails to take into account the near-contemporaneous evolution of the schools of Aegidianism and Scotism. Nor does it take into account the active role which the mendicant orders played in building up the followings of their favorite sons.¹¹⁷

Despite the difficulties, medieval thinkers themselves were able to differentiate between Thomists and non-Thomists (i.e., those thinkers who belonged to the Augustinian, Scotistic, and Nominalist [or Ockhamist] schools). Aquinas' intellectual heirs were first designated as "Thomists" during the early years of the fourteenth century.¹¹⁸ Of course, it was easy to

distinguish empirically between those who openly attacked Thomas and his defenders, especially if such was the stated purpose of a work. But more often than not, the opposite was true. Thomists and non-Thomists alike drew freely from Aquinas' writings, plugging his terminology, concepts and theses into their quodlibetals and commentaries with a heady abandon.

Of all the different genres of Thomism, that which was brought to fruition during its "primitive" stage (between 1274 and 1350) is the most difficult to define and characterize.¹¹⁹ Practicing their own brand of "cafeteria" Thomism, Aquinas' earliest followers bickered incessantly among themselves; and often diverged from Thomas himself.¹²⁰ Thus, Giles of Rome defended Aquinas' theses on the unicity of substantial forms, but parted from his former master's teachings in his interpretation of the distinction between essence and being. Moreover, due, perhaps, to contradictory statements within the supposed corpus of Aquinas' writings (which, at the time, included a number of spurious works), the early Thomists often seem confused as to what Thomas had actually taught.¹²¹ For that matter, so too were the neo-Augustinians.¹²² In yet other cases, the primitive Thomists upheld Aquinas' theses but used different arguments. Thus, John Quidort of Paris defended the distinction between essence and existence, but not in the Thomistic sense.¹²³ Even Natalis deviated from Thomas in his arguments on the existence of God.¹²⁴ At a more basic level, however, the early Thomistic school was bound together by a common adherence to three Aristotelian tenets: the unicity of substantial form in creatures; matter as the principle of individuation; and the real distinction between essence and existence.¹²⁵

Providing the philosophical underpinnings of the Thomistic world view, the application of these Aristotelian principles spilled over into the theological realm and would, as time went by, steadily expand the ideological arena in which the struggle between the two schools took place. Thomistic epistemology provides us with a case in point. To put it plainly, the Thomists held that people come to know through sense experience in contradistinction to the Augustinian theory of divine illumination. In other words, the Thomists differed from the neo-Augustinians in their understanding as to how human beings could know God and understand revelation. Similarly, because Thomism was built upon a fundamentally different concept of theology than was Augustinianism, members of the two schools would invariably arrive at different conclusions when faced with the same theological question.¹²⁶

Resonating with doctrinal implications, these conceptual differences led to charges and counter-charges of heresy. The contest between the Thomists' intellectualist and the neo-Augustinians' voluntaristic perceptions of the soul is illustrative of the trend. Simply (and, perhaps, simplistically) put, whereas the Thomists ranked the intellect over the will in both humanity and God, the opposite was true of the neo-Augustinians. Therefore, in the eyes of the neo-Augustinians, the Thomistic concept of the soul reversed the "traditional order from right willing to right knowing" and thereby raised the specter of

determinism.¹²⁷ Likewise, Thomas' contention that a sinful act originated in a defect of the intellect provoked charges of Pelagianism.¹²⁸ Doctrinal concerns haunted Thomas' teaching on forms, thereby spawning yet more controversies over the Trinity, the Incarnation, creation and the sacraments.¹²⁹ Even the Immaculate Conception controversy, which was to figure so prominently in the Order's history during the fifteenth century, made its appearance during the school's formative years.¹³⁰ Pushed fully to their logical conclusions, the Aristotelian principles led to practical as well as theoretical consequences. In addition to the points of contention discussed above, the neo-Augustinians and the Thomists battled over the nature of the papacy, the Church and the justification of usury.¹³¹

DOMINICAN REACTIONS TO THE CONDEMNATIONS

Following a paradigm which was to continue through the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain, the Dominican hierarchy was prompted to act not by the polemics of outsiders, but by the activities of their theologians. In 1278, the General Chapter commissioned two lectors from Provence, Raymond of Mévouillon and John Vigouroux, to undertake a visitation of the English province in order to ascertain whether certain of the brethren had "caused scandal to the Order by detracting from the writings of Thomas Aquinas." Reacting to the perceived threat of a full-scaled ideological revolt by the English lectors, the General Chapter endowed the two visitors with extraordinary powers.¹³² Any friar found guilty of attacking either Aquinas' memory or teachings was to be punished, removed from office and exiled from the province.¹³³ Either the visitation was extremely effective or the dreaded English rebellion was a red herring.¹³⁴ In 1279, the general chapter added emphasis to their earlier displeasure by admonishing the brethren not to speak irreverently of Thomas or his writings.¹³⁵ There is no further evidence for anti-Thomist activities among the friars in the English province.

Yet, if the neo-Augustinian backlash within the Dominican ranks had been quelled, other English (and non-English) friars, eager to fall in step with the capitular directive, began exploring and defining questions on Thomas' natural philosophy and metaphysics in public disputations.¹³⁶ Unfortunately for them, they did so at a time when their religious superiors felt keenly the need to be doctrinally circumspect. In 1280, the general chapter admonished its lectors and *magistri* to restrict their *disputationes* to moral theology.¹³⁷ The capitular fathers did not deal with the matter again until 1286, when the *Correctoria* controversies had been well underway for a half-dozen years. At this point, the general chapter obligated all Dominicans to defend and promote Thomas' teachings.¹³⁸

Quickly established as the Franciscan official response to Thomism, the *Correctorium* provoked a Dominican backlash, inciting five young Dominicans

(William Hothum, Robert Orford, Richard Knapwell, William Macclesfield and Rambert of Bologna) to take up their quills and write *Correctoria* of William's *Correctorium*. What is, perhaps, the most curious thing about the involvement of the two mendicant orders in the *Correctoria* controversies is the fact that the Order of Friars Minor took a far more pro-active role than did the Order of Preachers. This, in turn, prompts the question of why the Dominican hierarchy was so reticent in the face of attacks from their traditional rivals. In the gloaming of the thirteenth century, the Order of Preachers was in disarray and its ability to effect the *cura animarum* for which it had been founded had been severely compromised. Reeling from the shock of the deposition of the Master General, Munio Zaporra, at the instigation of rogue Dominicans and Franciscan troublemakers, the Dominican hierarchy no doubt felt themselves to be in a state of chaos, besieged from within and without. The General Chapter of 1298 ordered provincials to make inquiries within their provinces about the injuries inflicted upon Dominicans by other religious.¹³⁹ Worried lest the Order lose the papal protections it had so long enjoyed, the General Chapter of 1297 admonished the brethren to refrain from verbally assaulting Boniface VIII in their sermons.¹⁴⁰ It did not help. In 1300, Boniface promulgated *Super Cathedram*, requiring the friars to receive diocesan licenses from the episcopacy before being allowed to preach.

Yet other *acta* reveals that the diffinitors and superiors were just as worried about rebellion among the *fratres communes* as they were by the plots being hatched by their Franciscan enemies. By 1303, the general chapter was complaining that capitular legislation was being widely ignored.¹⁴¹ The General Chapter of 1296 concurrently ordered priors to provide their convents with secure jail cells and not to incarcerate their friars without the counsel and assent of the provincial prior and chapter.¹⁴² Moreover, Dominican unity was rent by factions within the Order: spanning from the class divisions between the *magistri* and the *fratres communes*; as well as the ideological divisions among the lectors themselves over the teachings of Aquinas. The unceasing activities of these pugnacious *theologi*, writing polemics against their brethren as well as re-igniting feud after feud with the Franciscans and seculars alike, provoked the Dominican hierarchy into action. Fresh from the wars over mendicancy and the upheavals caused by the Franciscan Spirituals, the Dominicans were suspicious of their traditional rivals and dubious of their orthodoxy. The stage for the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain was set.

The Historical Background of the Controversies

IN MANY RESPECTS, THE CONTROVERSIES BETWEEN HERVAEUS NATALIS AND Durandus of St. Pourçain were the by-product of the clash between the Thomist and Augustinian theological traditions discussed in the last chapter. At least, such is the assumption underlying the previous historiography of the subject. To a great extent, this is true. But both Natalis and Durandus, as well as the conflict between them, were also shaped by the peculiar world of the friars' intellectual milieu and the ecclesiastical structures which encompassed it. Thus, although the conflict shared the primary impulses of the broader Augustinian-Thomist struggle of which it was a part, it was also an uniquely Dominican phenomena. Obviously, the repeated interventions of the Dominican hierarchy did much to define the controversies. So too, did the Dominican practices of endowing scholastic terms with variant definitions and of modifying scholastic curricula and exercises so as to suit their own personal needs. But, as is witnessed by their hagiography, early histories and sermons, the Dominicans also differentiated themselves from their secular and mendicant peers in innumerable other ways, each of which, in turn, was to some extent influenced by the manner in which they conceptualized themselves as Dominans and the ideals which they believed the Order of Preachers embodied. Considered cumulatively, these, and other, dimensions of the Dominican experience resulted in the friar preachers' perceiving and reacting to the controversies between Natalis and Durandus differently than did non-Dominicans. The aim of this chapter is to delineate the manner in which Dominicans viewed the controversies between our two antagonists.

Current scholarship has provided us with a set of guideposts by which to explore the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain. First, unlike the rest of the Church, the Order of Preachers did adopt some form of Thomism during the fifty years following Aquinas' death. Having established that, the question not answered in the historiographical corpus is why. But any consideration of this paradox leads to yet other

questions: namely, who were the early Thomists within the Dominican Order?; what differentiated them from their Augustinian-oriented brethren?; what distinguished them from non-Dominican Thomists?; and what ties bound them together as a group? Although a comprehensive examination of any one of these last four questions would constitute a dissertation in and of itself, the first segment surveys what is known about the first Dominican Thomists and their early formation into a recognizable group.

Another era of historical research has provided us with two other givens. First, despite the formation and growth of the Thomist camp, the majority of Dominican lectors remained loyal to the Augustinian tradition. Second, although several of the leading figures within this Augustinian camp within the Dominican Order also dissented from Aquinas' teachings, they were neither investigated nor censured by the Dominican hierarchy. Yet Durandus was. So what was different about the case of Durandus? In an attempt to answer this question, the second segment of this chapter examines the lives and writings of Durandus' immediate forerunners in dissent at the Parisian convent of St. Jacques.

As was mentioned in the Introduction, what little is known about the lives and ecclesiastical careers of Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain is scattered far and anon. By establishing the basic chronology of the two antagonists' lives, as well as the fundamental characteristics of their thought, section three locates Natalis and Durandus as members of the Order of Preachers; and as theologians adhering to opposing schools who lived in the same convent, served on the same commissions and taught in the same *studia generalia*. The fourth section in this chapter examines the issues and events which propelled the Dominican hierarchy to investigate and censure Durandus' writings. In doing so, it is necessary to dissect how and why those specific theses, drawn from Durandus' writings, came to the attention of Dominican religious superiors and why they were considered dangerous. In other words, this fourth segment investigates the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain; and then establishes the reasons behind the censure and condemnation of various theses held by Durandus.

EARLY DOMINICAN THOMISTS

Even though a variety of individuals and groups contributed, directly and indirectly, to the dissemination of Thomas' thought and writings; and to his posthumous acquisition of *auctoritas* within the Order of Preachers, not all of them were Thomists. Although their stories and the cumulative effect of their actions are intertwined, it is necessary to distinguish between those Dominican scholastics who were actually Thomists, i.e., scholastics who accorded Thomas extensive authority within their own theology and adhered to a majority of the defining doctrines which characterized his thought and

those within the Order who were merely admirers.¹

By applying this definition, Thomas' early Dominican supporters can be divided into three groups. The first group of friars are those who contributed to the dissemination of his writings but either were not scholastics themselves or did not appropriate his major teachings. Second, many Dominicans, focused on the pastoral, appropriated large chunks of Aquinas' moral theology, especially that contained in the *Secunda secundae*, but left the rest of the Thomistic corpus alone. Third, there were the Dominican scholastics who actually adhered to many of his teachings, or thought that they did. It is this last clause which enables the first Dominican scholastics to come to Thomas' defense to be called Thomists.

The earliest evidence of activity by medieval Dominicans who could (and often have been) called Thomist dates from the 1270's and 1280's. For the most part, these "primitive Thomists" were drawn from the ranks from the young English and Italian Dominican lectors, less grounded in the Augustinian tradition than were their elders.² Although a few of the Italian friars had been Aquinas' students, this cannot be said of either the majority of their fellow Dominican Thomists within either their own province or that of their English cousins. Instead, most Dominican Thomists writing before the 1290's, like William Hotham and Thomas Sutton, seem to have acquired their knowledge of Aquinas' teachings second-hand, either through the dissemination of his writings or through the lectures of Dominican theologians sympathetic to Aquinas' views.³ Thus, the first generation of Thomists was largely self-taught, haphazardly drawing their knowledge of Thomas' teachings from a myriad of miscellaneous texts and chance conversations with his former confreres.⁴ Needless to say, one result of this was that their understanding of Aquinas' thought was less precise than was that of the generation which followed. Despite the unformed nature of their Thomism, these primitive Thomists did much to set the stage for the later debates between Hervaeus and Durandus.

As was mentioned in the previous chapter, following the English visitation of 1278, the Oxford Dominicans constituted the Thomist avant garde, defending Aquinas' teachings against all comers. The first instance of any scholastic coming forward to champion Thomas' teachings was the Belgian Giles of Lessines whose *De unitate formae*, was written in 1278 against the attacks of Kilwardy. Most of the other works in defense of Thomas before 1280 were authored by English Dominicans.⁵ The most spectacular of these, of course, were the by-products of the *Correctoria* controversies. But of the *Correctoria* polemics, only that of Thomas Sutton and, to a lesser extent, Richard Knapwell, has been recognized by modern scholars as reflecting a genuine understanding of Aquinas' teachings.⁶ However, their lack of a mastery of the Thomistic corpus does not mean that their writings and actions did not influence the evolution of Thomism within the Order of Preachers.

Instead, Knapwell's primary relevance to our present investigation lies in the ecclesiastical ramifications which resulted from his altercation with John

Pecham.⁷ In 1284, Pecham condemned Aquinas' teachings on the unity of form. After having been silenced by Pecham in 1284 for continuing to teach the doctrine, Richard Knapwell, like many a disgruntled medieval before him, set out for Rome to appeal to the pope. Unfortunately, when he arrived, he found not Honorius IV, but Nicholas IV. After keeping Knapwell waiting for a year, Nicholas IV condemned him to perpetual silence. Richard retired to Bologna where, according to apocryphal accounts, he continued to teach the Thomistic theses and slowly went mad.⁸

Although interesting, in and of themselves, what is relevant about these events is not what happened but the manner in which the Dominicans viewed and reacted to them. First, as is evident by the litany of complaints itemized by William Hothum, Knapwell's provincial, the English Dominicans perceived their conflict with the English primate to be an extension of the Franciscan-Dominican rivalry and the prohibition of the teaching on unity of forms to be an attack on their Order.⁹ Second, both the prohibition and Knapwell's censure were considered to be unfair and were widely resented. Third, Hotham and other English Dominicans protested that not only was the unity of forms a doctrine of their Order but so too were all of Aquinas' teachings. Incredibly, this assertion was made as early as 1284, well before the Dominican hierarchy had even begun to take official notice of the conflict. Fourth, the Dominican Thomists reacted not by silent acquiescence but instead by publishing yet more quodlibetals proving the doctrine's orthodoxy. Fifth, their protests and polemics caused the Order of Preachers, through the *acta* of the general chapter of 1286, to obligate all Dominicans to defend and promote Aquinas' teachings.¹⁰

Due, perhaps, to Knapwell's censure, in conjunction with the repressive atmosphere which followed the events of 1286, the Blackfriars, despite their precocious attachment to Thomism at its conception, did not, as a group, remain active in its cause for long. Instead, they became preoccupied with the decline of Dominican influence at Oxford, the constitutional struggles with Henry of Harclay and the advent of Oxford "calculators" for most of the first quarter of the fourteenth century.¹¹ As a result, the Oxford Dominicans did not take part in the controversies between either Durandus and the other Dominican Thomists on the continent, or between the young theologian and their hierarchy. In fact, as their extant manuscripts attest, they seem to have failed to notice Durandus altogether; for they never cited him in either the pro or con sections of their questions.

In contrast, the history of primitive Thomism within the Italian provinces is somewhat harder to assess.¹² Not surprisingly, Aquinas' former students, such as Bernard of Trilia, Albert of Brescia and Remigio de Girolami, formed the nucleus of the first little band of Thomists.¹³ However, many, like Remigio, Thomas' pupil and Dante's teacher, defended Aquinas while deviating greatly from his teachings.¹⁴ But this does not mean that they were not Thomists. Indeed they considered themselves to be just that. Moreover, the Italian

provinces were always on the cutting edge of promoting Aquinas' doctrines within their boundaries, often coming into conflict with Masters General and general chapters in their efforts to do so. Thus, brimming over with the enthusiasm engendered by their newly created province, Dominicans from the Sicilian province were instrumental in the movement for Aquinas' canonization. Similarly, the Roman province was rebuked by the General Chapter of Perugia in 1308 for using Aquinas' *Summa* (instead of the *Scriptum*) as the primary text for teaching.¹⁵

Moreover, the Italian provinces did produce a spectacular lineup of Thomists during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. In addition to John of Naples and Bernard Trilia, this list also included Ramberto de Primadizzi, who both first authored his *Apologeticum veritatis* in response to William de la Mare's *Correctorium* and then proceeded to defend Aquinas' writings against the critiques of Henry of Ghent, Giles of Rome, Richard Middleton and Matthew of Acquasparta.¹⁶ Indeed, after about 1290, even those Italian Dominican thinkers who never reached the rarefied atmosphere at Paris were, to some extent, Thomists. But the problem, in terms of classifying them as such, is that they seemed to have been open to a great many other influences and interests at the same time. For instance, many scholars have characterized the theology of Bombologno of Bologna as a fusion of Albert the Great, Peter of Tarentaise and Thomas Aquinas. The interpretation of Bombologno, the principle lector at the Bolognese *studia* between 1277 and 1279, is further complicated by the facts that he not only relied heavily on the writings of Bonaventure but also lectured extensively on Aristotle.¹⁷ As a result, his extant writings have given impetus to contradicting interpretations of his thought.

The early history of Thomism in the French province is somewhat complicated by the Dominicans' possession of two chairs in theology at the University of Paris. Except for Durandus of St. Pourçain, the holders of the chair reserved for French Dominicans tended to be pro-Thomist. In contrast, that reserved for foreigners would be held by Eckhart and Dietrich of Freiburg. On the whole, however, the French province, simultaneously blessed and burdened by the convent of St. Jacques, played a significant role in the early history of Thomism, producing Giles of Lessines, John Quidort, Bernard of Trilia, Bernard of Auvergne, Armand of Bellevue, William Peter Godin and Peter of Palude.

During its early history, Thomism made no inroads at all in some Dominican provinces. This is true of the Ibernian, or Spanish, province which would overcompensate for its early neglect by producing Torquemada in the fifteenth and de Vitoria, de Soto, and Melchior Cano in the sixteenth centuries. Similarly, Thomism does not appear to have wielded any influence in Vienna until the time of Henry Totting of Oyta.¹⁸

Of all the Dominican *studia*, those which produced the medieval German Dominican meisters have generated the most debate in our own day. The

German provinces did produce a number of prominent Thomists, including John of Freiburg, John and Gerard of Sterngassen, Jean Picard of Lichtenberg; and later, Henry of Lübeck.¹⁹ Intended to be a manual for the formation of Dominican novices and based on teachings of Aquinas, Albert the Great, Giles of Rome and Hervaeus Natalis, the *Summa* of Nicholas of Freiburg, “seems to have been composed in direct response to recommendations of the [Dominican] general chapters.”²⁰ But Cologne’s Thomism was overshadowed by its Albertinism and the Rhineland Dominicans would produce the Order’s first serious critics of Aquinas to arise since Kilwardy.²¹

Despite their geographic diversity, some common themes did bind the early Thomists together. First, almost all of the major figures of early Dominican Thomism spent a significant proportion of their academic careers at either the Dominican *studium generale* at Oxford or at the one located within the Parisian convent of St. Jacques. On the one hand, this is not surprising due to Oxford and Paris’ relative prestige and status. On the other hand, the lack of evidence of Thomistic activity at the Order’s *studia generalia* at Montpellier, Bologna, and Cologne during these early years is more than thought-provoking.²² Second, most of the tenets and concerns which bound the group together were dictated by the critiques of Aquinas’ detractors. In other words, the early Thomists did not set out with an agenda which they hoped to impose on the Order or the *studia generalia*. Instead, much of primitive Thomism’s “incoherence” is the result of its having been constructed piecemeal. Because of the reactionary nature of Thomism during this early stage, the primary concerns of its proponents shifted from debate to debate. This is true especially in the first stage of 1277–1290, but is also applicable, albeit to a lesser extent, for the period between 1290–1334.

Third, realists in popular, as well as the philosophical, sense of the term, the early Thomists were neither mystics nor authors of treatises on spirituality. Nor, for the most part, were they directly involved in the Order’s *cura animarum*. Instead, accorded increasingly influential positions both within the Order and within the Church, the early Dominican Thomists tended to be “men of affairs.” Thus, Hervaeus Natalis was provincial of France throughout most of his struggle with Durandus. Although he was later removed from office by the Franciscan Pope Nicholas IV, Bernard of Trilia was elected as provincial of Palenica in 1291.²³ Similarly, Thomas of Jorz (d. 1310), the Blackfriar who replied to Scotus’ attacks on Aquinas, was the prior provincial of England (1297–1303), the confessor of Edward I and, later, the cardinal of Saint Sabina. Peter of Palude was appointed Archbishop of Jerusalem in 1329. Clement V appointed William Peter of Godin as *lector curiae* or *magister sacri palatii* in 1306; cardinal priest in 1312 and cardinal-bishop in 1317.

As is to be expected, the steady promotion of the early Thomists to high office had an inestimable impact on the histories of the Order and on the Thomist tradition. First, juxtaposing the relative lethargy of the general chapters, these Dominican religious superiors actively did what they could to

promote Thomism within the Order. Ranging from polemics with Peckham to papal appeals on behalf of Richard Knapwell, the pro-Thomist activities of William Hotham as the English provincial nearly rivaled those of Natalis' own French provincialate. Between 1280 and 1283, John of Vercelli directed Galieno of Orte, then a lector in Italy, to excerpt and condense Thomas' *Secunda secundae*.²⁴

A second, much less tangible result of the daily actions and assignments of the early Thomists as religious superiors, diplomats and *magistri* arose out of their extensive interactions with other institutions within the Church. This is not to argue that ecclesiastical politics, such as their rivalry with the Friars Minor or their resentment over the "tyrannical" actions of Nicholas IV dictated the theology or metaphysics of the early Thomists. But it is possible, if not even probable, that their prolonged exposure to the often less-than-friendly behaviors of the institutional representatives of competing theological traditions not only re-affirmed their adherence to Aquinas' teachings but strengthened their identification of Thomism with the interests of their Order.

THE PREDOMINANCE OF THE AUGUSTINIAN TRADITION, 1277–1307

Following the visitation of the English province in 1278, the voices of Dominicans critical of Aquinas were temporarily muted. For the remainder of the thirteenth century, the Augustinian backlash unleashed by the Condemnations of 1277 flowed through the *quodlibetals* of Franciscans, Augustinians, and seculars; and it was against these attacks that Aquinas' early disciples within the Order took up the gauntlet. Yet, by the turn of the century, Dominican opposition to Thomas' teachings was readily apparent in the writings of some of the Order's most notable theologians; namely, Dietrich of Freiburg, Meister Eckhart and James of Metz.²⁵

Of the three, the case of Dietrich of Freiburg (ca. 1240–1318/1320) is the most puzzling.²⁶ Dominican records attest to his administrative and intellectual accomplishments. Having read philosophy and theology at Cologne between 1260 and 1270, he was appointed lector at the convent in Freiburg in 1271. Somewhat later, in 1280/1, Dietrich was the lector at Tier. On September 3, 1293, he was elected prior provincial of the German province. In 1296/7, he returned to St. Jacques where he taught as *magister actu regens* for almost a decade. The provincial chapter at Koblenz elected him to the office of diffinitor in 1303. Thus, he was a member of the general chapter in 1304 and again in 1310. In 1310, he was appointed the vicar of the German province.²⁷

The contradictory nature of Dietrich's progressive climb up the Dominican ladder, on the one hand; and his virulent anti-Thomism, on the other; presents students of the case of Durandus of St. Pourçain with an intriguing comparison.²⁸ A prolific writer whose interests spanned fields of metaphysics

and natural philosophy, Dietrich has been categorized in a number of ways. Engelbert Krebs suggested that he was a student and intellectual descendent of Henry of Ghent.²⁹ However, we know this is not true because while non-Dominicans were allowed to attend Dominican classes, the contrary was not true. A much more likely proposition is that Dietrich was either one of Albert the Great's students or, at the very least, a member of the renowned Albertist circle which had begun to flower in the late thirteenth century.³⁰ Certainly, his thought and interests suggest Albert's influence. The editors of Dietrich's *Opera omnia* have charitably labeled him a "pre-Thomist neo-platonist."³¹

Dietrich was writing at the same time, in the same place, as was Durandus of St. Pourçain. Moreover, Dietrich departed from Thomas' metaphysical teachings on all of the fundamental issues discussed earlier: concentrating particularly on Thomas' notion of being and his theory of cognition. In point of fact, one of Dietrich's early treatises, *De ente et essentia*, is a rebuttal of Thomas' own theory of being, encapsulated in a tract with the same title.³² Dietrich's writings read like a litany of anti-Thomistic teachings. Among the Thomistic theses with which he disagreed were the real distinction between being and essence; the whole doctrine of the intellect; the beatific vision; the theory of accidents in regard to the Eucharist; and matter as the principle of individuation.³³ More curious still, the language which Dietrich employed was far more obnoxious than that of Durandus. Descending to the level of *ad hominem* attacks, Dietrich lumped Thomas and his disciples in with the *communiter loquentes*—and called their ideas "elementary," "ridiculous," "false," and even "sophistical."³⁴ Despite all of this, there is no record that Dietrich ever incurred the retribution of the Dominican leadership or the polemical wrath of Dominican Thomists. After 1310, Dietrich simply disappears from view, leaving no trace in the records save for his writings and the influence he had on the mystical theology of some of his students such as Berthold de Moosburg and for his accomplishments in the history of science.³⁵

In comparison to that of Dietrich, Meister Eckhart's (c. 1260–1328) stance towards Thomas is much harder to define and has been the recent subject of a number of revisionist studies.³⁶ While the topic, on the whole, exceeds the scope of our investigation, several notes regarding Eckhart's relationship with his order are relevant. First, like Dietrich, Eckhart was elected and appointed to a number of influential offices. Thus, in 1294, after reading the *Sentences*, he was recalled to Germany to serve as prior of the convent in Erfurt and as vicar to Thuringia. In 1302, he served as the *magister actu regens* in the extern chair at St. Jacques. In 1313, the general chapter ordered him to serve a second term as regent master at Paris. Between 1314 to 1322, he was the vicar of Strassbourg for first Berengarius of Landorra and then Hervaeus Natalis. Second, while Eckhart defended Thomas' theory on the beatific vision, he diverged from most fundamental points of the order's newly adopted "common teaching". Third, again like Dietrich, there is no evidence that he was censured by his order and criticized by his confreres for his theological

deviations from Thomas. In addition, neither the initial investigation into his preaching nor the eventual condemnation of certain of his teachings by John XXII was directly linked to his rejection of Thomistic fundamentals.³⁷

In contrast to the cases of Dietrich of Freiburg and Meister Eckhart, that of James of Metz serves as a prelude to the controversies which, a few years later, would surround Durandus of St. Pourçain. Like Dietrich and Eckhart, James deviated from the teachings of Aquinas. Unlike his fellow Germans, however, he was not a master of theology nor did he ever hold an office within the order. Yet, James provoked an almost immediate reaction by his Thomist brethren, the most notable of which was Natalis.³⁸

Our knowledge of the life and activities of James of Metz is sparse.³⁹ In fact, the bulk of the secondary literature on James is devoted to determining the dates of his writings.⁴⁰ We know that he twice glossed the Sentences.⁴¹ The second reading probably occurred in Paris, under the direction of Rambert of Bologna. Because James' name fails to appear in any of the lists of *magistri*, it is probable that he never became a master of theology. After writing his *Commentary*, James drifts off into obscurity, making no further appearances in the Dominican records.⁴²

Manuscripts of the second glossing, which occurred sometime between 1295 and 1302, contain a number of additions, many of which seem to have been inspired by John Quidort of Paris. A third redaction of James' *Commentary*, comprised of elements drawn from both glossings, was later compiled by one of James' students.⁴³ Although this later redaction faithfully reflects the ideas and concepts contained in the previous two redactions, the tone of the arguments against Thomas in the third redaction are strident.⁴⁴ It was against this last redaction, compiled by our anonymous student, that Natalis directed his *Correctorium fratris Jacobi Metensis*, some time between 1302 and 1307.⁴⁵ Although the focus of his attack is on the third redaction (compiled by James' student), the text reveals that Natalis was familiar with the second redaction of James' *Commentary*. The last two redactions of James' *Commentary* and Natalis' *Correctorium* comprise the sum total of the conflict between the two Dominicans, thus prompting the question of the significance of the debate.

Aristotelian in his philosophy and thoroughly Augustinian in his theology, James of Metz "was not a Thomist and did not want to be one."⁴⁶ But neither was he in the neo-platonic, mystical tradition of the Rhineland Dominicans as were Dietrich and Eckhart. Nor was he simply an anti-Thomist. Instead, the two formative influences on James thought were Henry of Ghent and Peter Aureole. For the most part, however, he seems to have simply struck off on his own, paving the way for future scholastics into an intellectual country which would later be called nominalist.

James of Metz opposed Aquinas in both the metaphysical and theological realms. In metaphysics, James was undecided about the real distinction between essence and existence; and rejected the Thomistic theses on relations; and matter as the principle of individuation. Although he accepts some aspects

of Thomistic psychology, he deviates from the Thomistic fundamentals of epistemology, requiring that the agent intellect and the *sense* material (*phantasmata*) act in harmony. In theology, James' infidelities to his order's newly adopted "common teachings" are even greater. In point of fact, he disagrees with the Thomist view on the nature and object of theology. James also opposed Aquinas on the nature of virtue, grace, the effects of sin and the nature of original sin.⁴⁷ In addition, he also rejects the Thomist understanding of the sacraments. For example, James' understanding of the Eucharist was that "in transubstantiation the form of bread was replaced by the soul of Christ, with the matter of bread remaining."⁴⁸

While the precise arguments of the controversy between James and Natalis will be delineated in the next chapter, their exchange, itself, opened the door for the controversies between Natalis and Durandus. In fact, the attention which the conflict between the two bachelors has garnered, both from medieval Dominicans and from contemporary scholars, is rooted in the debate's relevance to the second controversy. Medieval Dominicans, themselves, also identified James of Metz with Durandus, as is witness by the continual linking of their works in the major medieval Dominican catalogs. Similarly, the arguments set down by Natalis in his *Correctorium* provided the intellectual scaffolding for the arguments with which he would later chasten Durandus.⁴⁹ In other words, because the teachings by which James of Metz dissented from Thomas paralleled those for which Durandus would later be censured, the controversy between Natalis and James can be seen as the prologue to that between Natalis and Durandus.

THE ANTAGONISTS

Written, for the most part, by theologians and philosophers, previous accounts of the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain have been framed within the broader struggle between Thomists and Augustinians for ideological hegemony within the fourteenth-century Church. Floating well above the mundane considerations of ecclesiastical rivalries and petty conventual politics, their accounts of the controversies soar along on the plane of ideas and abstractions, dipping now and then into this sphere to acknowledge the occasional capitular *acta* or ecclesiastical censure.

But Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain were real men whose arguments were shaped by the concrete historical context of the Dominican Order in the early fourteenth century; as well as by the ideological battles swirling about them. The purpose of this section is twofold. First, it will establish the basic chronologies of their lives. Material not directly related to the controversies will be included in order to highlight the manner in which their personalities affected the controversies. Secondly, by examining the junctures at which their paths crossed, this section will depict the successive types of relationship which existed between the two men (i.e., fellow religious,

mentor-protégé, rival theologians, religious superior and friar; and battling antagonists). In other words, their lives explicate their texts in a way in which the texts do not do for themselves. In actuality, the fact of their relationship did much to form the controversies. In several passages within his studies on the controversies, Koch relates how Durandus not only highly esteemed Natalis' tracts but looked forward to answering them. In fact, aside from the official reprimands of his Order, Natalis' critiques were the only attacks which Durandus did bother to answer in any depth; thereby making his regard for his former mentor the *sine qua non* for the controversies, themselves.

HERVAEUS NATALIS

By necessity, biographies of Hervaeus Natalis have been amalgams of fact and conjecture.⁵⁰ This is due, in part, to the paucity of historical records detailing the facts of Natalis' life. Of the extant primary sources containing information about Natalis, the most helpful are the Dominican chronicles of his contemporaries; namely those of Bernard Gui, Gavagno de la Flamma and Laurent Pignon.⁵¹ Like most medieval chronicles, however, these are mined with contradictory and inaccurate data.

Despite the obstacles, some details of Natalis' life are known. Hervaeus Natalis was born in Brittany, probably between 1250 and 1260. He may or may not have already possessed a master of arts degree before entering the Order of Preachers at the convent of Morlaix, in the diocese of Tréguier, in 1276. There is some indication that Natalis had been a priest before his entrance into the Dominicans.⁵² Late medieval Dominican sources abound with apocryphal accounts of Natalis as a wealthy secular, richly endowed with benefices, who experienced a mid-life conversion. However, there is no direct evidence to support this view.

Natalis next appears in the Dominican records in a list of those present at the Provincial Chapter of Rouen in 1301.⁵³ By 1303, Natalis was assigned to the convent of St. Jacques at the University of Paris where he signed, along with John Quidort of Paris and Durandus of St. Pourçain, a petition supporting Philip the Fair's attempt to convoke a council in his war with Boniface VIII.⁵⁴ During his tenure at St. Jacques, Natalis lectured on the *Sentences*, probably between 1301 and 1303. In 1307, Natalis was appointed to the Dominican commission charged with the investigation of the Templars. Also in 1307, Natalis incepted as a master of theology and served as *magister actu regens* until either 1309 or 1310. It was during this period that Durandus read the *Sentences* under Natalis' direction between 1307–1308. In 1309, Natalis was elected provincial of France at the provincial chapter of Chartres.⁵⁵ It is likely that he continued teaching as a master of theology throughout the first year of his provincialate.⁵⁶ He remained provincial of France until 1318 when he was unanimously elected Master General.⁵⁷ Throughout the winter of 1318–1319, Natalis participated in the case against Jean de Pouilly.⁵⁸ Hervaeus Natalis

died in Narbonne on his way to attend the canonization of Aquinas at Avignon in August 7, 1323.⁵⁹

The hallmark of Natalis' tenure in office, first as provincial of France, then as Master General, was the attempted reform of the Dominican Order.⁶⁰ Striking at the fundamental corruptions which were plaguing the order, the general chapters, under Natalis' leadership, promulgated a series of *acta* aimed at curbing the privileges of the elites. Preachers general, masters of theology and inquisitors were ordered to take part in choir and to eat in the refectory.⁶¹ Similarly, acts abolishing the use of titles and curtailing the widespread availability of private cells were passed with the same intent.

Of particular interest among his reforms were those aimed at bringing the *studia generalia* under control. Thus, he abolished the use of the professorial title *magister*, promulgated a number of measures to ensure student discipline, and centralized the curriculum of and appointments to the *studia generalia* under the direct control of the Master General. More curious still, Natalis placed an unusual emphasis to the building up of "good" conventual libraries as a means of promoting education.⁶² This last measure may have been aimed at convents located in the provincial backwaters which, despite the constitutional mandate that every *studia* must have a lector, often relied heavily upon what few books they had for the education of their members and the implementation of their ministries.⁶³

Key among his educational policies was the attempt to attach an ideological litmus test to magisterial and student appointments within the Dominican schools. During his tenure as provincial of France (1309–1318), Natalis had influenced the choice of John of Naples (1309), Peter of Palude (1310) and James of Lausanne (1314) as bachelors of theology. Natalis also implemented the same agenda during his generalate, although the names of his appointments are less well known. Their tenures as lectors and regents reinforced the legislative imposition of Thomism and provided the young ideology the time it needed to be assimilated into the Dominican intellectual tradition.

Natalis' solicitude for the Order's reputation was a second theme in his generalate. Thus, friars were forbidden to reveal publically either the existence or the punishment of apostates and criminals within the Order.⁶⁴ Inextricable from both his attempts at reform and his preoccupation with the Dominicans' reputation, were a number of attempts at reconciliation with the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Anxious that the Preachers avoid exacerbating the Order's already-tense relationship with the episcopacy, Natalis repeatedly admonished his charges to obtain licenses from the local primates before preaching or hearing confessions in a diocese. Because of the tensions with the bishops (and with John XXII), Natalis requested that the brethren refrain from maligning the reputations of popes and prelates because they are the successors to the apostles.⁶⁵ In fact, Natalis seems to have been particularly successful in both establishing and maintaining a rapport with his pugilistic pontiff. Certainly, his

encyclical letters to his friars are full of admonitions to annotate and obey John XXII's letters.⁶⁶ Indeed, the alliance between Natalis and John XXII was the apex of papal-Dominican relations during the period covered by this dissertation.⁶⁷

Natalis' literary output was extensive.⁶⁸ An indefatigable polemicist, Natalis managed, in his lifetime, to engage in polemical battles with Henry of Ghent (between 1301 and 1307); James of Metz (between 1302 and 1307); Duns Scotus (around 1307); Godfrey of Fontaines and Peter of Auriol (both in 1310); and, of course, Durandus of St. Pourçain (between 1307 and 1323).⁶⁹ Thus, aside from his *Commentary on the Sentences*, most of his works were quodlibetals and polemical tracts aimed at correcting the unconverted.

Natalis, as a thinker, has received mixed reviews. Natalis' predilection towards subtlety has been remarked upon by both his and our contemporaries.⁷⁰ But although he has been characterized by his proclivity towards speculative and metaphysical issues, Natalis' thought, on the whole, appears more reactionary than original.⁷¹ His style has fared worse. Koch found him redundant.⁷² Martin considered Natalis' polemics to be "drawn out and tiresome."⁷³ Fries described his prose as "dull with a distinctly Gallic flavor."⁷⁴ In fact, the most charitable modern evaluation of Natalis' style has been Hauréau's succinct quip that it was "dry."⁷⁵

Similarly, Natalis' stature as an early Thomist has also been questioned. Although extolled by Grabmann for his defense of Thomism, more recent thinkers have noted areas in which he deviated from the *Doctor communis*, particularly in his rejection of the real distinction between essence and existence; and in the arguments he used for his proofs of the existence of God.⁷⁶ On the other hand, as far as we know, Natalis never consciously departed from any of Aquinas' teachings.⁷⁷ And, lest we are tempted to believe that Natalis was simply ignorant of the Common Doctor's teachings, we should remember that Natalis continually attempted to revise his adversaries' misinterpretations of Thomas' teachings. In fact, from these corrections, it is clear that although Natalis may not have mastered Aquinas' thought, he was familiar with the vast majority of his writings.⁷⁸ Intolerant of innovation and dissent, Natalis seems to have sought a homogenous, even homogenized, communal teaching within his order.

DURANDUS OF ST.POURÇAIN

Somewhat less is known about the life of Durandus of St. Pourçain.⁷⁹ Durandus was born in 1275 at Saint-Pourçain-sur-Sicule in Auvergne. Durandus tells us that he was raised "in faith and in obedience to the Roman Church."⁸⁰ He entered the Order of Preachers in the Clermont convent at the age of 19. He first enters into the Dominican records as a student at the *studia generalia* in St. Jacques when he, like Natalis, signed the appeal of convocation against Boniface VIII.⁸¹ On November 17, 1307, along with Natalis and Peter

of Palude, Durandus participated in the process against the Templars. Between 1307 and 1308, he wrote the first version of his *Commentary on the Sentences*. Faced with the possibility of censure from his order, Durandus wrote a second redaction of the *Sentences* between 1309 and 1312. In 1312, Durandus was, finally, allowed to incept as a master of theology. In the Spring of 1313, Durandus was appointed Master of the Sacred Palace by Clement V.⁸² In 1316, he served as an ambassador for the papacy, as well as papal chaplain. On August 26, 1317, Durandus was appointed to bishopric of Limoux as a reward for his diplomatic efforts.⁸³ He was transferred to the see of Le Puy en Velay on February 13, 1318. In 1326 was transferred again to the bishopric of Meaux.

Unfortunately, Durandus' episcopate was just as stormy as was his career as a Dominican.⁸⁴ Having been transferred to the see of Puy-en-Velay, Durandus took an oath (as was customary in that diocese) renouncing temporal jurisdiction over his canons and clergy in July of 1318.⁸⁵ Because of the oath (which he called a "*vinculum iniquitatis*"), his initial efforts to reform the diocese failed. In May of 1320, Durandus published a codex of statutes, rules and regulations for the diocese. A conflict with his clergy ensued and Durandus appealed his patron, John XXII. Between 1323 and 1325, the case between Durandus and his clergy was submitted to a number of arbiters and courts. In the end, Durandus lost not only the case but his bishopric as well. John XXII informed the rebellious presbyters that their bishop had told them "*fictis causis*" and, having been transferred to the see of Meaux, Durandus never set foot in his diocese again.⁸⁶

Durandus' literary works can be divided into four basic categories. The first, and most obvious, is that of the three versions of his *Commentary on the Sentences*.⁸⁷ Secondly, Durandus wrote at least one treatise on canon law: *De origine jurisdictionum sive de jurisdictione ecclesiastica et de legibus*.⁸⁸ Third, like Natalis, Durandus responded to John XXII's request for an opinion on the Spirituals' assertion regarding the poverty of Christ and the Apostles.⁸⁹ The bulk of Durandus' extant writings, however, are those which he penned in his war with Natalis and the early Thomistic school.

Influenced by Peter Aureole and James of Metz, Durandus has been characterized as a "conceptualizing nominalist". A brilliant and original thinker, Durandus was responsible for a number of innovations on the topic of relations and the noetic of man. But his titles *Doctor resolutissimus* and *Doctor modernus* are perhaps more indicative of his personality than of his metaphysics. Indeed, Durandus' contemporaries remarked upon his clear thinking, tenacious memory and eloquence but recognized his impatience with doctrines which conflicted with his own.⁹⁰ Adopting the stance of the perennial defender of intellectual liberty, Durandus often proffered the excuse that he was simply seeking truth.⁹¹ Thus, for Durandus, within the realm of philosophy, reason was elevated above authority.⁹² Yet he was as Augustinian in his theology as he was Aristotelian in his philosophy, placing Scripture above reason in matters of faith.⁹³ The conflicts with authority which this

attitude led to were probably only exacerbated by his habit of referring to his opponent as an “*idiot*” and his opponent’s argument “*asinium*.”⁹⁴

After the death of Natalis in 1323, Durandus would take part in two other controversies. First, he would preside over the trial of Ockham in 1326, using his position as chairman to modify or delete those theses drawn from Ockham’s writings with which he, personally, happened to agree.⁹⁵ Secondly, he was both a participant in and a victim of the controversy generated by John XXII’s teachings on the beatific vision.⁹⁶ This episode is interesting because it, too, sheds light on the personalities of the two men. Faced with possible censure from the theological community, John XXII sought an opinion from Durandus who, characteristically, responded with a “devastating assault” on the position of his papal patron.⁹⁷ The irascible pontiff responded in kind, submitting Durandus’ opinion, along with Thomas Waleys’, to a commission for judgement. In 1333, Durandus’ was censured yet again.

HERVAEUS NATALIS AND DURANDUS OF ST. POURÇAIN

The controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain were inextricable from two other conflicts: that between the neo-Augustinians and the Thomists; and that between Durandus and the Order of Preachers. Mirroring the two broader conflicts, that between Natalis and Durandus was comprised of two dimensions: first, the fight over the substance of Durandus’ teachings, as well as their possible ramifications; and the concurrent dispute over the limits to legitimate theological dissent and ecclesiastical authority.

The conflict between Durandus of St. Pourçain and the Dominican hierarchy, of which Natalis was a part, took place in three distinct phases. The first began in 1307 with the publication of Durandus’ *Commentary on the Sentences* and consisted of that text and the initial reactions it provoked. The second began in 1312 with the publication of the second redaction of Durandus’ *Commentary* and lasted until 1317 when Durandus was removed from Dominican obedience by his elevation to the episcopacy. The third stage, beginning in 1317 with Durandus’ accession to the see of Limoux and lasted until well after Durandus’ death in 1334, consisted largely in the Order’s attempt to eradicate Durandus’ theological influence within its schools.

In contradistinction to that broader conflict, the polemical war between Natalis and Durandus was more like a fluid mass of themes, some of which ran continuously from 1309 to 1316. Because of its multidimensional nature, this conflict will be analysed in two stages; the first from 1307 to 1311 and the second from 1312 to 1317.

Following the timetables drafted by Koch, most historians have held that the conflict between Durandus of St. Pourçain and the Dominican Order began with the publication of Durandus’ *Commentary on the Sentences* in 1307. Or,

viewed from another vantage point, it's possible to argue that the theological meleé started with the hue and cry raised by Durandus' more doctrinaire confreres in reaction to the publication. Certainly, there is no evidence that Durandus' views had landed him in hot water with his superiors before 1307. Moreover, the vigilant supervision of provincials and the innumerable capitular crackdowns on the Parisian *studium generale* provide ample doubt that Durandus would have been allowed to continue his studies had his orthodoxy been considered questionable by the Dominican authorities prior to 1307. Indeed, the teachings from which Durandus deviated had not yet been officially adopted by the Order of Preachers: it was his writings which prompted the capitular legislation formalizing the assimilation of Thomas' teachings into the Dominican ethos.

While there was only one reference to *venerabilis fr. Thomas* in his *Commentary*, the authorities which Durandus cited are intriguing. These were Godfrey of Fontaines, Henry of Ghent, John Duns Scotus, Giles of Rome and Hervaeus Natalis.⁹⁸ Of particular interest is the fact that he did not cite the recently disgraced James of Metz, whose ideas so closely paralleled his own. In addition to a sustained assault on Aquinas' doctrinal teachings, the work also contained a number of theses which, in the eyes of many, lay outside the pale of orthodoxy. In particular, Durandus' teaching on relations led him to reject the commonly accepted understanding of issues of the Incarnation and the Trinity,—topics which may well have resonated with Albigensian themes in the minds of his more traditional confreres.

Yet, if Durandus' affiliation with his Order may well have been essentially harmonious in 1307, the same could not be said of his relationship with Natalis. Natalis incepted as *magister* in 1307, earning the chair in theology reserved for the French Dominicans at the University of Paris. In that year, Durandus was his *cursor Sententiarum*. As a result of this relationship, Natalis would have simultaneously assumed a great deal of power over, as well as responsibility for, Durandus' academic career. It would be trite to say that Durandus disagreed with many of Natalis' closest-held theological tenets before 1307. With hindsight, deep-seated differences of opinion, even some form of mutual antagonism between the two men, seem a foregone conclusion. Moreover, their public duties as Dominicans appointed to a *studium generale* (e.g., sermons and disputations, the small size and closed nature of the St. Jacques community, and their mentor-protégé relationship) ensured that both Natalis and Durandus would have been aware of the other's fundamental theological orientation, if not intimately acquainted with the syllogistic intricacies of each other's theses.⁹⁹ And, considering their volatile personalities, as well as their shared propensity to rant and rave, publically and in print, it is doubtful that the two could have co-existed without friction.

But while Natalis and Durandus may have shared some form of mutual antagonism, their conflict was fundamentally substantive; perennially focused on the question of whether the thesis being debated did in fact correspond to

the reality of the supernatural order. This is not to say that the controversies were entirely free of petty partisan politics or *ad hominem* attacks: vitriol has rarely been engaged with so much dash and vigor. But it is to argue that each acted in good faith, drawing upon theological traditions well established in the Dominican Order. When Durandus rejected the teachings of Aquinas, and of Aristotle before him, he did so as a “friend of truth.”¹⁰⁰ And he did so in opposition to a mentor who, in turn, would eventually defend the truths of the natural order against him, proclaiming that, “even if the rocks at the bottom of the sea were unknown to any mind, they would still be basically and materially true because they have an essence independent of any intellect.”¹⁰¹

Perhaps due to the older Dominican’s truculent personality, most scholars have assumed that the controversies between the two men began with Natalis’ reaction to the publication of Durandus’ *Commentaria in IV libros Sententiarum*. This, however, is not true. Rather, the conflict began with Durandus’ “Utrum sex ultima predicamenta dicta de Deo vel de creaturis dicant aliquid absolutum vel dicant solum respectum.”¹⁰² Although this work is not extant, we do have Natalis’ “Utrum in Deo sit relatio realis ad creaturam,” in which Natalis was either answering a question contained in the first redaction of Durandus’ commentary by the same title or an earlier, more extreme, version of the *quaestio* which Durandus had advanced either orally in disputation or in writing prior to the commentary’s publication. These writings, dating from the years 1307–1308, establish the mentor-protégé conflict as a prelude to, as well as a contemporary with, Durandus’ conflict with the other early Thomists and the turbulence which would rock his relationship with the Dominican hierarchy.

Although fundamentally unanswerable, the question of why Durandus initiated this intellectual ambush on his mentor deserves some consideration.¹⁰³ In part, of course, Durandus’ actions were but another by-product of his charming personality. Yet, considered within the context of intra-Dominican politics, his actions are puzzling. In the first years of the fourteenth century, many bachelors tested the boundaries of censorship in their disputations: at least one scholar has argued that overwhelming pressures, analogous to those generated by the reality which underlies today’s dictum of “publish or perish,” propelled young clerics to adopt increasingly daring positions.¹⁰⁴ But even so, Durandus’ initial attack is surprising for two reasons. First, the Dominican hierarchy was doing everything in its power to curb its more radical theologians and to instill some measure of conformity withing its schools. More specifically, Dominican lectors had been obligated, via legislative prescription, to promote and defend Thomas’ teachings since 1286. Second, Natalis incepted as magister in 1307, earning the chair in theology reserved for French Dominicans at the University of Paris.¹⁰⁵ As a result, Natalis would have simultaneously assumed a great deal of power over, as well as responsibility for, Durandus’ academic career. With such a master as Natalis, Durandus would have been playing with fire even if he had merely

inadvertently explored those aspects of Natalis' arguments which were weak. But, having heard Hervaeus' Parisian lectures in 1302 and 1303, Durandus was well acquainted with his master's teachings.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, Natalis' later replies make it clear that Durandus has done much more than raise doubts regarding his (and Aquinas') teachings in the *recitando*, *narrando*, and *declarando* portions of his *quaestiones*. Durandus had committed himself to his solutions by including them in his *determinationes*. In other words, Durandus had not merely discussed Natalis' (and Aquinas') teachings. He had attacked them.

At any rate, immediately after launching his quodlibetal assault on Natalis, the first redaction of Durandus' *Commentary on the Sentences* was published. Durandus would later claim that friends had published and disseminated this work without either his knowledge or permission.¹⁰⁷ But whatever Durandus' intentions, the work immediately provoked reactions on a wide variety of other fronts as well. Several considerations indicate that, at least outside of the Dominican Order, Durandus' *Commentary* was received with a great deal of interest, if not outright support. There was widespread dissemination of the extracts drawn from the text as well as of his more innovative theses in lectures and *quodlibetals* in Dominican as well as non-Dominican *studia generalia*. In fact, the very structure of the Dominican educational system, as outlined in the first chapter, facilitated the spread of the conflict among other Dominican lectors. Durandus' views would also be attacked in the subsequent years not only by other Dominican scholastics, such as James of Lausanne but by Carmelites such as Guido Terreni and Gerard of Bologna, as well. What cannot be gauged, however, is the extent to which his theses were the subject of disputations and conversations among the Dominican lectors, since there are no extant records of these disputations or conversations.

Between 1307 and 1309, Natalis wrote four treatises which are relevant to the controversies. The first work, *Defensio doctrinae fratris Thomae*, was written at the behest of the Master General, Aylmeric de Pianza, and may or may not have been aimed directly at Durandus.¹⁰⁸ The *Defensio* followed the plan of Thomas' *Summa* and was the first comprehensive apology for Thomism. In either late 1307 or early 1308, Natalis disputed the question, "*Utrum in Deo sit relatio realis ad creaturam*", replying to the corresponding question in Durandus' *Commentary*. In 1308, Natalis wrote *Quodlibet II*, which concerned the subject of relations and *Quodlibet III*, which was composed of a series of questions on the act of cognition. Although Natalis' *Quodlibet III* may have been aimed at Peter of Aureole, the arguments encapsulated in the text were equally applicable to many of Durandus' more innovative teachings. On July 14, 1309, Natalis was elected provincial of France. As such, he would be present at the general chapter in Saragossa held that same year.

Following the paradigm begun by the Oxford friars during the *Correctoria* controversies, this emerging conflict between two Dominican *theologi*, stationed at St. Jacques, spurred the Dominican hierarchy to take several steps. Alarmed by Durandus' critique of Thomas and the uproar which it was

causing, the General Chapter of Saragossa in 1309 decided to answer the question of the Order's fidelity to Aquinas' teachings once and for all. Two of the Chapter's acts are particularly relevant here. First, Dominican students away from their provinces were granted the right to sell their books, except for their Bibles and the works of Aquinas, in the case of need.¹⁰⁹ Secondly, and more importantly, lectors and their assistants were to be required to lecture and determine questions according to the teachings of Thomas Aquinas.¹¹⁰

That these decrees were considered a vindication of Natalis' position, at least by some, is evident in the enrollment of other Dominican scholastics into the fray. Of these, the most notable is Peter of Palude whose own *Commentary on the Sentences*, published in 1310, is almost exclusively directed against the first redaction of Durandus' own *Commentary*. The work is notable for its copious extracts drawn from Durandus' first *Commentary*, which has since been lost. In 1310 or 1311, John of Naples also joined the fray by directing some of the questions in his own *Commentary* to the refutation of Durandus' arguments. Evidently, Durandus' shared the Thomists' interpretation of the Chapter's actions: following the promulgation of the Chapter's *acta*, he began a second redaction of his *Commentary on the Sentences*.

By 1312, Durandus had completed and published the second redaction of his *Commentary*, and, as a result, was allowed to incept as a master of theology.¹¹¹ In this second redaction, Durandus omitted a few of his most extreme theses, modified others and added innumerable citations of Aquinas to bolster the legitimacy of his arguments. Glorieux has suggested the Durandus wrote the work in the hope that its publication would soothe the Dominican authorities and confuse the enquiries of the commission.¹¹² In addition to the second redaction of the *Commentary*, Durandus also responded (and published) two quodlibets, both of which were directed, at least in part, to the objections raised earlier by Natalis. These two quodlibets have been entitled *Quodlibet Parisiensis I* and *II*. In addition to the two Parisian quodlibets, Durandus wrote two other works between 1312 and 1313: his *Tractatus de Habitus* and his *Quaestiones de libero arbitrio*. Despite the many modifications contained in the second redaction of Durandus' *Commentary*, the Dominican leadership was still alarmed. At the provincial level, chapters strengthened their prohibitions against lectures and writings which criticized Thomas. For example the provincial chapter of Provence, held in Orthez in 1313, ordered that its lectors teach in accordance with the writings of Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great and Peter of Tarentaise.¹¹³

Echoing the concern of the provincial chapters, the General Chapter of Metz in 1313 forbid the friar preachers to "read, determine, respond or hear assertions contrary to the *sanior et communior* doctrines of Aquinas."¹¹⁴ Reinforcing the legislation of 1309, the capitular diffinitors mandated a three-year course on Thomas' writings as a prerequisite for being sent to Paris.¹¹⁵ The Chapter also forbid the brethren to publish their works outside the Order unless they had first submitted them to the Master General for censorship.¹¹⁶

Finally, and most importantly, the diffinitors also appointed a commission to examine the works of Durandus.

Headed by Hervaeus Natalis, the commission was comprised of Yves of Caen, John of Parma, Peter of Palude, John of Naples, Thierry de Saxe, John of Prato, Jacques of Lausanne, Yves of Laon and Mathew Orsini of Rome.¹¹⁷ The commission began its inquiry during Pentecost of 1313. Having adopted the relatively new inquisitorial method of dealing with individual articles (*extractio*) rather than complete texts, the committee did not read the whole of Durandus' *Commentary on the Sentences*.¹¹⁸ Instead, they examined a list of 93 propositions drawn from the text by Peter of Palude (who had examined books I and III) and John of Naples (who had been given the responsibility of scavenging books II and IV for error). On July 3, 1314, they forwarded their findings, in the form of a syllabus of errors, to Berengarius of Landorra, then Master General, who was in London for the General Chapter. Of the 93 propositions examined, 91 were condemned and characterized as erroneous, false, blasphemous and, curiously, temerarious. Ten of the articles examined were pronounced heretical. Only four were censured for being *contra Thomam*. Perhaps because Natalis was head of the commission, it is not quite surprising that the censured theses were those which the two men had spent the last seven years debating.

What is startling, however, is the manner in which the Dominicans, themselves, viewed the inquiry.¹¹⁹ In the eyes of his Order, Durandus was a Dominican and hence any proceeding against him was a matter of internal discipline. Officially, the inquiry into his writings commenced not because of his theological war with Hervaeus Natalis and many of the Order's regent masters but because his *Commentary on the Sentences* had been disseminated without having first been submitted to one of the Order's censors. Throughout the tenure of the first committee (1312–1314), Durandus was not only given the time and opportunity to correct his so-called errors but he was allowed the opportunity to answer the charges in writing. When the procedure began, Durandus was still technically a bachelor. Had he not redacted his *Commentary on the Sentences*, it is doubtful that he would have been allowed to incept as master of theology in 1312. Moreover, the extent to which he needed to modify and re-write his opinions was somewhat subjective, for the commissioners did not always agree on the verity or orthodoxy of the theses extracted from his texts. Article 23, for example, was considered false by four members of the panel but true by the other three.

Throughout the inquiry, the Dominicans followed the general practice of consulting a canon lawyer. Showing that, for the scholastics at least, it is indeed a small world, the canon lawyer consulted in both inquiries against Durandus was none other than Jacques Fournier, the future John XXII.¹²⁰ Like Peter Olivi before him, Durandus defended himself by claiming that his commentary had never been intended for publication, therefore the commission was dealing with private opinions, not public teachings. At the

time of the commission's judgment, however, Durandus was already in Avignon, still a Dominican but serving as master of the sacred palace. Having censured his opinions, the Chapter gave him the benefit of the doubt, allowed him to go his way and awaited his formal answer to the charges.

In the months of August and September of 1314, Durandus, having received a copy of the list of errors, responded to the charges in his *Excusationes*. Calling the commission a bunch of "carping critics" and its list of errors "idiotic," Durandus offered a new defense: he rejected the authority of the commission to judge the doctrinal correctness of his works. Throughout much of the *Excusationes*, Durandus explained his own interpretation of the ten articles which had been declared heretical. Seeking a larger stage on which to explain himself and his views, Durandus held and published the first of three quodlibets in Avignon in December of 1314. During the following two Decembers, he would repeat the process, thereby increasing the ecclesiastical significance of the controversy. Perhaps unknowingly, his appeals to non-Dominican *magistri*, launched in the presence of the pope, would serve to increase his alienation from his brethren.

During the winter of 1314–1315, Natalis (again following the order of his superiors), responded to the *Excusationes* with his *Reprobationes excusationum Durandi*. Natalis begins his *Reprobationes* by protesting the purity of the commission's motives and conclusions.¹²¹ Natalis proceeds to give a lengthy consideration of what limits must be placed on theological disputations and under what circumstances those limitations might be disregarded.¹²² In the *Reprobationes*, Natalis examines Durandus' explanation for his teaching on each of the ten articles condemned. In each case, Natalis applies four criteria: the teaching of the Church on the article in question; the teaching included in the first redaction; the teaching which Durandus now offered in its stead; and whether his apology cleared up the condemnation.

Hervaeus responded to Durandus' other counterattacks in kind. Between 1314 and 1317, Natalis wrote four additional works attacking his former protégé. First, in his *Correctiones super dicta Durandi in Quodlibet Avenonense I* and then in his *Correctiones super dicta Durandis in precedenti quodlibet*, Natalis disputed the arguments contained in Durandus' first two quodlibetal disputations in Avignon. *De articulis pertinentibus ad quatuor libros Sent. Durandi* consisted of Natalis' personal commentary on the list of errors compiled by the commission. Most significant of all, however, in his *Evidentiae contra Durandum super IV^{um} sent.* Natalis examines 38 articles in which Durandus' deviated from the teachings of Aquinas on the sacraments.

Between 1313 and 1317, Natalis was again aided in his exchange with Durandus. In 1313, the Carmelites joined in; Guido Terreni with his *Quodlibet I* and Gerard of Bologna with his *Summa Theologiae*. That same year, Thomas Wylton, a secular, entered the battle against Durandus with his *Quod in intellectu possint esse plures intellectiones simul*. In 1314, James of Lausanne published his own *Commentary*, which mirrored that of Peter of Palude. In

1315, and then again in 1317, John of Naples wrote held his quodlibetal disputations which, responding to Durandus' two works, were given the similar titles of *Quodlibetals Parisiensis I* and *II*.

Between 1314 and 1317, the Dominican leadership took additional steps to preserve the primacy of Aquinas' teachings within the Order. Although the General Chapter of 1314 (London) possessed a copy of Durandus' *Excusationes*, the capitular fathers agreed with the commission's findings and imposed the list of errors on the Order. In addition, they further integrated the study of Thomas into the core curriculum of Dominican higher education.¹²³ In the following year, the General Chapter of Bologna reaffirmed the Order's policy of censorship. Thus, lectors were forbidden to teach or to dispute doctrines against the "common doctrines" of Thomas and against those commonly held within the church, such as articles of faith, morals or the sacraments.¹²⁴ The prohibited topics paralleled Durandus' "innovations". In addition, friars holding the office of master of students were given the task of reporting writings which were against doctrine or in error.¹²⁵ In addition, the Chapter ordered that all Dominican libraries possess copies of Aquinas' writings.¹²⁶

Equally indicative of Durandus' influence were the actions of the provincial chapters. Thus, in 1315, the provincial chapter of Rome tried the case of Hubert of Guidi, a bachelor at Florence. Accused of opposing Thomas in a public disputation (not just in a Dominican school but in a cathedral at a lecture attended by seculars and other religious!), Hubert was found guilty, and ordered to recant of his errors in public. Hubert was then transferred to the convent at Pistoia and placed on a fast of bread and water for ten days. Rubbing salt in an open wound, the diffinitors also deprived Hubert of his office of lector for two years and forbid him to take part in future disputations.¹²⁷ Despite the example made of Friar Hubert, others followed. For instance, the provincial chapter of Toulouse in 1316 tried other friars for the same crime.¹²⁸ More intriguingly, that same year, Friar Bartholomew, a Cistercian would be reprimanded by the theological faculty at Paris, for carrying Durandus' theories on relations but a few steps further than their originator.¹²⁹

Beginning in 1316, censorship within the Dominican Order became more systematic. In that year, the General Chapter of Montpellier ordered the provincials and their diffinitors to monitor the intellectual activities of the friars within their provinces.¹³⁰ Offenders were to be reported to the Master General.¹³¹ More importantly, the General Chapter called for a second examination of Durandus' writings. Replaying the events of 1313–1314, this second commission was headed by Natalis and its list of errors was compiled by Peter of Palude and John of Naples. In 1317, after examining the commission's findings, *Articuli in quibus mgr Durandus deviat a doctrina venerabilis doctoris nostri fratris Thomae*, the General Chapter declared Durandus guilty of deviating from Thomas on 235 points and imposed the use

of the list of errors on the Order. Differing in nature from its predecessor, this second list is intriguing in several respects. First, the wording of both the title and the censures indicate that by this point, in 1317, Thomism had, at least for the highly educated friars who served as capitular diffinitors, become the commonly held opinion of the Dominican Order. Secondly, a much greater proportion of the articles examined in the second list were drawn from speculative theology rather than moral theology. The Dominicans were no longer primarily concerned with the application of Durandus' teachings in the Order's pastoral ministry but instead had followed the chain of arguments from the practical to the speculative and was now worried about the assimilation of his metaphysics into the Dominican *schola*.

Durandus was saved from the threat of disciplinary actions by John XXII who appointed his chaplain to the see of Limoux in August 1317. The following February, Durandus was transferred again, this time to Puy-en-Velay. In the end, Durandus would end up with the see of Meaux, from which he would write yet a third redaction to his *Commentary on the Sentences*. Resonating with recidivism, this last redaction would contain many of the theses which he had previously recanted.

Despite the two censures, Durandus did leave disciples in his wake. In 1344, the General Chapter of le Puy censured Thomas of Naples for contradicting the teachings of Saint Thomas.¹³² But, for the most part, he was disavowed by his brothers in religion. In 1330, Durandellus attacked Durandus' theories in his *Evidentie contra Durandum*.¹³³ More than a century later, he would again be bombarded by the Thomistic interpretations of Capreolus. Curiously, Durandus engendered reactions in his colleagues more petty than objective. Hence John of Sterngrassen's invective against the Dominican bishop: "Durandus is a petty pilferer (*quidam latrunculus*) of Peter of Auvergne, as all Frenchmen generally are, because they are men without any invention."¹³⁴ Writing shortly after Durandus' death in 1334, the master general admonished the friars "to insist on the solid doctrines of Saint Thomas," and thus avoid the dangers inherent in following Durandus.¹³⁵ Or, even more vitriolic, the epitaph proposed for his tomb:

Durus Durandus jacet hic sub marmore duro,
An sit salvandus ego nescio, nec quoque curo.¹³⁶

Yet, outside the Order of Preachers, Durandus was widely respected. He was "one of the most frequently cited Dominicans of the century."¹³⁷ Jean Gerson recommended Durandus' works to his students.¹³⁸ At the University of Salamanca, the "chair" of Durandus would rival those of Thomas and Scotus well into the sixteenth century. In contrast, Hervaeus Natalis suffered a different fate. Natalis ended his career as a polemicist in 1316, was elected Master General in 1318 and thereafter continually pulled into the unending rounds at the Avignon curia. Although Natalis would later be lauded by Dominican chroniclers for his defense of Thomism, he achieved neither

CONCLUSION

Scattered throughout the ecclesiastical documents which chronicle the drama of Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain are glimpses at the Order of Preachers as it really was in the early fourteenth century. Peripheral figures come forward, then vanish. Dietrich of Freibourg was fast becoming famous as a Dominican *magister* within the Augustinian tradition, but then became intrigued with the origin of rainbows. Implacable young friars doggedly studied Durandus' texts in the solitude of their cells and, in the documents, their punishments are intermingled with those accorded friar preachers guilty of more tangible transgressions. Upon the papal veto of their first election and the geographic relocation of their convocation, the diffinitors of 1318 heartily acclaim Natalis' unanimous election as Master General under the watchful gaze of John XXII's legates. A euphoric John of Sterngrassen pens vitriolic epitaphs upon Durandus' death in 1334 while the capitular fathers repressively pass over the event in silence. One after another, the records catch the friar preachers, individually and collectively, if just for an instant, in prose-like snapshots that almost brings them to life.

Of course, it is Hervaeus and Durandus who emerge most vividly from the annals. Natalis enters the Order late in life and progresses, ploddingly, through the Dominican *studia* in the company of men half his age. Durandus moves up to the front rank of Paris' intellectuals. Not surprisingly, their reactions to the world they found themselves in also differed. Natalis woos and wheedles his friars to submit to their superiors, to the customs of the Order, to John XXII and, not lastly, to himself. Durandus steadfastly refuses to acknowledge the authority of the 1314 commission; heading a similar deputation nearly twenty years later, he grows uncharacteristically pensive, and refuses to affix his signature to Ockham's condemnation.

Torn between two theological orientations, the Order of Preachers, at the advent of the fourteenth century, was divided, at least among its elites. While others had dissented from the teachings of Aquinas, they had done so in the tradition of Kilwardy or of Albert the Great. Durandus' innovations sparked the firestorm which engulfed his theological career precisely because they were innovations. In retrospect, we can see that the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain resulted in the legislative reactions which transformed the teachings of Aquinas into a binding doctrine; and in doing so, Thomism would acquire a status inside the Dominican Order that it would never enjoy among non-Dominicans. But the real significance of the controversies lies not so much in the resulting institutional implementation of Thomism. Instead, the relevance of the controversies between Natalis and Durandus is to be found in the concepts over which they fought.

Selected Issues in the Controversies

AS WAS DESCRIBED IN THE PREVIOUS CHAPTER, DOMINICAN GENERAL and provincial chapters responded to the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain not only by legislating an adherence to certain of Aquinas' teachings but by twice censuring theses drawn from Durandus' writings. Keeping the representative nature of Dominican government in mind, the promulgation of this body of legislation was a significant process for it implies that, between 1309 and 1317, a majority of the capitular diffinitors had been persuaded to mandate that the brethren subscribe to those teachings of Aquinas from which Durandus' had dissented. Although these were defensive measures, designed to steer Dominican lectors away from the more hazardous ramifications of Durandus' teachings, they served to accelerate Aquinas' acquisition of *auctoritas* within the Order.

One of the problems with arguing for a causal relationship between the controversies and Aquinas' acquisition of *auctoritas* among the friar preachers, however, is the fact that Natalis and Durandus never specifically debated the topic of Aquinas' *auctoritas*. Instead, their polemical battles were fought, at least initially, over the orthodoxy and verity of a series of theses drawn from Durandus' writings. Despite this, there is an apparent correlation between the controversies and the fruition of Aquinas' *auctoritas* within the Order of Preachers. Throughout his turbulent career, Durandus determined innumerable *quaestiones* in such a way as to render Thomas' earlier teachings on the matter at hand either inaccurate or irrelevant. Thus, Durandus' intellectual activities explicitly detracted from Aquinas' *auctoritas*. Reciprocally, Natalis' counterattacks seem to have bolstered Aquinas' *auctoritas* for a number of reasons. First, they discredited Durandus' deviations. Second, Natalis was known to be not only a champion of Thomas but the recognized leader of the early Thomists. Moreover, proving the verity of Aquinas' teachings was the stated purpose of many of Natalis' polemics. Thus, it is only natural to assume that his arguments against Aquinas' critics strengthened Aquinas' authority within the Order of Preachers in general and among Dominican theologians in particular.

But establishing a causal link between the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain, on the one hand; and the concurrent growth of Thomas' *autoritas* within the Dominican Order, on the other; is complicated by two factors. First, the philosophical and theological interests of scholastics of the early fourteenth century were not the same as those of the mid-thirteenth. In other words, while Natalis and Durandus may have disputed on the same topics as did Aquinas and his adversaries, the questions they asked and the concerns which prompted them were quite different. Secondly, while Natalis may have been (and was certainly known as) Aquinas' most ardent defender, intellectual historians since late in the last century have been noting, with increasing frequency, that Natalis departed often and radically, if unknowingly, from the teachings of his master.¹ Not unnaturally, this raises a number of questions: most notably, whether the teachings which Durandus attacked and which Natalis defended were, in fact, those of Thomas; and, if not, how the controversies between the two fourteenth-century Dominicans could have influenced the growth of Aquinas' *autoritas* within the Dominican Order. The second of these two questions, dealing with the correlation between the controversies and the authority of the person and texts of Aquinas, will be addressed in [chapter 5](#). The aim of this chapter is to map out the role which Aquinas' teachings played in the controversies.

Our chosen methodology for doing so is a historical exploration of a small selection of the debates which comprised the controversies for, even if we were to limit our discussion to those areas which accentuate the underlying issue of Aquinas' *autoritas*, the points of conflict between Hervaeus and Durandus are so numerous that it would not be possible to discuss them all in the present context. Because of this, although topics such as original sin, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the sacraments and free will each comprised a significant proportion of the polemical battles between the two men, these issues will not be treated except peripherally. One of the motivations for jettisoning these topics is that they have already been treated, at least in part, elsewhere.² Instead, this chapter will explore the as-yet largely unexamined polemical battles between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain over the topics of relations, cognition and theology.

Several factors justify this selection. First, the two Dominicans' conceptualization of theology determined their understanding and application of the Aristotelian concepts which, in turn, comprised the matter of their more sensationalist disputes. Second, Durandus' primary historical significance has been located in his theories of relations and the process of intellection.³ Perhaps because these were the areas in which Durandus was the most innovative, they generated the most agitated, even vitriolic, of the debates. Third, each of these debates in some way serve as a yardstick by which to measure the relative "Thomism" and "Augustinianism" of the two theologians, as well as their respective attitudes towards the teachings, texts and person of Thomas Aquinas. Finally, although this examination of the disputes is not

intended to serve as a triad of case studies, the paradigms which it yields will no doubt shed considerable light on the nature of the controversies as a whole.

THE DEBATE OVER RELATION

Almost imperceptibly, Natalis and Durandus' disputes over relations were an extension of the earlier debates between Aquinas and Henry of Ghent; and between the authors of the *Correctoria* and William de la Mare. But the connectedness between these conflicts is not readily apparent for a number of reasons: relations did not play a central role in Aquinas' thought nor was it a topic of debate in the *Correctoria* controversies. Neither was it an established concern of the Dominicans who had departed from Thomas' teachings before Durandus: relation did not play a major role in the thought of Dietrich of Freiburg or in that of Meister Eckhart—nor was it implicit in their disavowal of Thomism.⁴ Yet, this disparity between the focus of the various debates is due largely to context, not the overall trajectories of the individual scholastics' theologies. With their metaphysical framework scaffolded by the concepts of essences, forms, genera and species, thirteenth-century thinkers were largely concerned with individuation and other issues tangential to determining distinctiveness between beings and things. In contrast, fourteenth-century thinkers, such as Durandus, inhabited an intellectual terrain wherein the metaphysical unity of earlier scholastics had long since fragmented and in which the problem was not to find out what differentiated related things but rather to establish a way of relating separate and distinct entities.⁵

Because the concept is so fundamental to any understanding of Natalis' and Durandus' arguments over the topic, let me begin with a cursory examination of the medieval concept of relations.⁶ Fundamentally, the medieval concept of relation was no different from that of the Greeks or even that of contemporary philosophers. The English "reference," the Greek $\pi\alpha\rho\zeta$ and the Latin *relatio*, as well as its synonyms, *referre* and *relatum*, all denote "a bearing or a towardness." Scholastics used other terms to denote the concept, including *ordo*, *se habere*, and, most commonly, *ad aliquid*. More prosaic phrases, such as a "pointing towards" are also scattered throughout their commentaries and quodlibetals. In all of these cases, the term relation, as well as its synonyms, denote the identity of what was represented in the second being. Although scholastics developed innumerable theories of relation, each contradicting the other, most accepted the traditional definition of a relation as "a reference (*habitus, respectus*) of one being to another."⁷

Garnered from Aristotle's *Categories*, book 1 of the *Organon*, the salient feature of the medieval concept of relation was the scholastic presupposition that all relations were accidents. Basically, the concept of accident was employed to distinguish a being (*ens*) and its attributes (*ens entis*, roughly the being of a being). In general, scholastics approached accidents in two ways: either as accidents (real entities) or as accidents as predicates. The application

of this theory was complicated by two Christian doctrines: first, that no accidents could be attributed to God; and secondly, that the Trinity was constituted by relations.⁸ As a result, medievals developed two distinct approaches to the problem of relations—one which applied to creatures and one which applied to God.

In keeping with the scholastic predilection for employing a highly technical wordstock, medievals also used specific terms to define and refer to the various elements of a relation.⁹ Of these, the three basic lexical building blocks employed by scholastics were those which denoted the three elements necessary to constitute a relation: the subject, the term and the fundament. The subject, or substrate, or a relation is that from which (*a quo*) the relation proceeded and denoted the thing that is referred. At the other end of the relation is the term, or the being or thing to which (*ad quem*) the subject is referred. Known collectively as *extrema*, or terms, both the subject and the term, existing simultaneously, were necessary for knowledge of the relation. The cause of the relation between the two *extrema*, such as size, color, causation or identity, was referred to as the ground, or *fundamentum*. Beginning with Aristotle, ancient and medieval thinkers used the concept of the *fundamenta* to classify and catalogue different types of relations.

In general, the schoolmen sorted various types of relations according to two systems of categorization. First, from chapter 15 of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* Delta, a lexicon of ambiguous philosophical terms, they appropriated three classifications of relations: the numerical, the causal and the psychological. Onto Aristotle's original three-fold division, the scholastics superimposed their own three genres of relations: the predicamental, the transcendental and the logical, or relations of reason. Predicamental relations were comprised of relations *secundum esse* and the first two Aristotelian categories (i.e., the numerical and the causal); and were considered to be a distinct category of accident. Transcendental relations were those types of relations which did not conform to the definition of accidents, such as means, appetite and creation. Predicamental and transcendental relations were "real" relations, or relations caused by an extra-mental foundation in the subject. Encompassing those relations mentioned but not explicitly classified by Aristotle, logical relations, or 'relations of reason', were those which were caused by and whose existence depended upon intellectual activity.

Unlike most thirteenth-century and like some other fourteenth-century scholastics, the question of relations was Durandus' central metaphysical preoccupation. Moreover, like most other fourteenth-century scholastics, Durandus employed his concept of relations to answer a plethora of philosophical and theological queries. In general, these intellectual problems fell into one of three groups. First, he employed relations to explain purely philosophical puzzles, such as the affiliation between the intellect, the will and their objects. Second, he applied relations to metaphysical questions, such as the relationship between God and creatures. Third, Durandus used his theory

of relations in his teachings on the divine mysteries.

The connection between Natalis and Durandus' debates on relations and the earlier post-Thomist controversies is rooted in the primacy which Durandus' theory of relations played in his thought and the impact which that theory had on his theology. Because, for Durandus, theology was but applied metaphysics, his teachings on relations determined his answers to questions drawn from each of the areas itemized above.¹⁰ In other words, Durandus' theory of relations led him to adopt positions throughout the theological spectrum which flatly contradicted those held by the early Thomists. The controversies between Natalis and Durandus on relation were even more directly tied to the earlier debates. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, their conflict began with Durandus' attack on Natalis own theory of relation which, in turn, had been developed and articulated during Natalis' controversies with Henry of Ghent.¹¹ Finally, Durandus' attack on Natalis' and Aquinas' theories of relation signaled his enlistment in the conflict between Natalis and James of Metz, whose teachings on relation was similar to, albeit much more moderate than, those which Durandus was in the process of articulating.¹² In other words, when Durandus assailed Natalis' theory of relation, he was joining a brouhaha already in progress.

Because Natalis modified his own theory of relation, shifting and altering his own theses in response to Durandus' polemics, their debate on the topic was largely determined by Durandus' own innovative theories. As a result, any understanding of the conflict over relation must encompass a comprehension of what it was, in fact, that Durandus had actually taught.¹³ Durandus divided all being into three *modus essendi*: being in itself (subsistence); being in another (inherence); and being which was inclined towards another (relation). Defined another way, Durandus' three modes of being were: "being in itself (substance); being in another (accident) and being in relation to another (relation)."¹⁴ Within the Durandean schema, there were two types of relation: a real relation between different things (*res*); and a relation of reason. Durandus only accorded the status of a real relation to those relations which entailed some kind of causality or dependence, such as that between father and son, or between the mover and the moved. According to Durandus, these were in the minority, for most relations were those of reason (similarity, etc.). Finally, Durandus argued that relation was a mode of being distinct from its foundation, it did not even make a composite with it.¹⁵ It was the application of this last 'catch' to his theology of the Trinity; the divine nature of God; the sacraments and the noetic of the human soul, which was to get Durandus into trouble.

As Durandus' teachings on relations were generated primarily by his search for "new and simpler modes of thought," they naturally, and blatantly, diverged from those of Aquinas and the medieval Aristotelian tradition which he represented.¹⁶ Before advancing his own hypothesis, Durandus explicitly considered and then rejected two other approaches to the problem of relation

in his *Commentary on the Sentences*, the first being that of Aquinas and the Aristotelian tradition which he represented.¹⁷ In addition, he also explicitly criticized Aquinas' theory in those questions in which scholastics typically employed relations as a tool by which to solve some logical or theological difficulty, such as cognitive psychology. On the other hand, the vast majority of Durandus' later writings are primarily concerned with refuting Hervaeus' multifarious objections.¹⁸ Thus, it is somewhat difficult to discern whether Durandus' anti- or un-Thomist polemics on relation was aimed primarily at Aquinas or merely generated by his own troubled relationship with Natalis.

The extent to which Natalis' critiques of Durandus' writings on relation was an actual defense of Thomas is somewhat less nebulous. Beginning with his *In quatuor Libros sententiarum Commentaria* in 1309, Natalis fired off round after round of objections to Durandus' theory of relation.¹⁹ During this early stage of the conflict, Natalis' criticisms are generally restricted to the mechanics of Durandus' relation theory. For example, in his review of Durandus' treatment of the problem of relation in his *Commentary on the Sentences*, Hervaeus objected that his protégée's claim that a relation did not make a composition with its fundament was irrational.²⁰ Similarly, Natalis would later complain that Durandus' theory was laden with contradictions and inconsistencies.²¹ Only rarely did Natalis attempt to employ the nascent authority of the Angelic Doctor, preferring instead to appeal to Aristotle or, if need be, Augustine.²² With increasing frequency, however, he notes his former student's deviation from the *commune dictum doctorum*, thereby setting the precedent by which the Dominican Thomists' objections to Durandus' teachings would be couched in terms of departure from that of the Dominican *magistri* when they did not transgress the confines of orthodoxy.

One such case was Durandus' interpretation of the generation, or spiration, of the Holy Spirit, which was simultaneously the result of his own eclectic theory of relation and an attack on Aquinas' theology.²³ Although Durandus freely acknowledged the doctrine of the *Filioque* as held by the Latin Church, he completely discarded the Thomist synthesis of Trinitarian theology. Curiously, this is one of the few debates considered within this dissertation in which Durandus appealed to Aquinas' growing *auctoritas*.²⁴ But, as Natalis pointed out, Durandus had merely taken one of Aquinas' statements out of context and then used it to arrive a conclusion which was fundamentally irreconcilable with those of the statement's author.²⁵ Intriguingly, Durandus' statements make it clear that he not only departed from the teachings of the Order's most famous luminary, but that he was consciously dissenting from opinions commonly held by the *magistri* within his religious community.

Only a few examples drawn from Durandus' teachings on the generation of the Holy Spirit are needed to reveal the gross extent to which his writings in this area differed from those of his Thomist brethren. First, the modern doctor discarded Aquinas' terminology.²⁶ Second, Durandus rejected Aquinas' interpretation as to the manner and temporal order in which the Third Person

proceeded from the Second. For example, Durandus departed from Thomas' interpretation by positing that while the Son was generated according to the mode of the intellect, the Spirit was spirated according to the will.²⁷ Yet, Durandus did more than simply deviate from Aquinas' position. His teachings on the spiration of the Holy Spirit would open the door to charges of heresy.

Considering the tone of Durandus' vehement denouncement of Aquinas' Trinitarian theology as it was applied to the origins of the Holy Spirit, the scarcity of extant objections authored by Natalis is somewhat surprising. Two of these few are included in Natalis' *Correctiones supra dicta Durandi de Sancto Porciano in Primo Quolibet* and in his *De articulis pertinentibus ad primum librum sententiarum Durandi*.²⁸ For the most part, Natalis' commentary in the *Correctiones* was basically a syllogistic expository of the logical fallacies contained in Durandus' writings. In his *De articulis*, however, he painstakingly itemized not only the flaws in Durandus' syllogisms but explicated the precise manner in which Durandus' writings had departed from the Thomist synthesis. Defending his interpretation of Aquinas' texts, Hervaeus objected to Durandus' teaching that the principle of divine generation was a relation.²⁹ He also took issue with Durandus' theory of that the generation of the Son had chronologically preceded that of the Holy Spirit.³⁰

But of all Durandus' opinions, those which provoked the most volatile response from his Thomist brethren were those which had to do with the real distinction between the essence and the relations of the Persons of the Trinity.³¹ In both I, d. 3, q. 1 and I, d. 33 q. 1 of the first redaction of his *Commentaria in IV libros Sententiarum*, Durandus posited a real distinction between the essence and relations of the divine Persons, stating that, "quod relatio et essentia differunt in Deo realiter," and "quod relatio in divinis differt realiter a fundamento." These statements not only provided a stark contrast to the traditional view wherein the Persons were distinguished by their relations alone, but, in the eyes of Natalis and many others, violated the principle of divine unity or the oneness of God.

The gravity with which Durandus' teaching on the divine essence was received by Natalis and the Dominican hierarchy is underscored by the second redaction of Durandus' *Commentary on the Sentences*, written in 1312, before the first commission of inquiry was convened. In his *additiones* to the commentary, Durandus acknowledged that the opinion which many magistri believed he had asserted was, indeed, heretical. But, as he would reiterate in his *Excusationes*, his writings had been misunderstood.³² Hervaeus, of course, refused to believe him. Pressured by his professor's unending criticism, Durandus acknowledged that others had found difficulties with his position.³³ But despite the growing opposition to and the condemnation of his teachings on the real distinction by the commission of 1313, Durandus continued to reassert his theories, first in his *Quodlibetal Avignonense I*; and later, in the third redaction of his *Commentaria in IV libros Sententiarum*.

One of the most striking features of the plethora of rebuttals which Natalis lobbied against Durandus' teachings concerning the real distinction was the relative absence of a strict adherence to Thomas' own teachings. Reflecting the changing currents in fourteenth century scholasticism, Natalis, and most other Dominicans, had borrowed from the Franciscans a very minimalist form of modalism and thus had parted from Thomas' own writings on the Trinitarian question.³⁴ Thus, Thomas' actual writings on relation was not the core issue in the conflict between Natalis and Durandus over the real distinction between the essence and relations of the Divine Persons: instead, the contention centered explicitly on the issues of Durandus' deviation from the commonly held position and the orthodoxy of his singular opinions.

Although the two Dominicans had traded accusations of heresy in several of their other disputes, those exchanged in their debate over the divine relations generated two side debates, each of which was quickly subsumed into the more encompassing conflict over relations, itself. One of the more important side debates began when Natalis, misinterpreting Durandus' Trinitarian theology, charged his former pupil with Arianism. In an intriguing rhetorical maneuver, Durandus recast the argument in terms of the dispute between Joachim of Fiore and Peter Lombard a century earlier. For the remainder of the dispute, both scholastics would address not only the argument of their adversary, but would also expend considerable time and space delineating the relative positions of Joachim and the Lombard.

In many ways, the conflict between Joachim and Peter Lombard was an intriguing and oddly appropriate parallel for Durandus to have drawn.³⁵ As is well known, Joachim had attacked the Lombard, claiming that Peter, with his concept of "*summa quaedam res, nec genita, nec procedens*," had turned the divine essence into an additional entity and thus had rendered the Trinity a quaternity.³⁶ After an extremely close ballot, Joachim's own position was condemned by the Fourth Lateran Council.³⁷ Aside from the corollaries between the two sets of arguments, Durandus' choice of historical metaphors is curious for historical reasons. First, he chose an allegory in which he paralleled Joachim, whose own positions had been condemned and whose views had been refuted by Aquinas. Second, Natalis was one of the Church's foremost inquisitors into the activities of Joachim's more radical followers, the Franciscan Spirituals. By choosing such an allusion, it is almost as if Durandus was deliberately bating his former mentor. In retrospect, it was, politically, an unwise choice: even if his teachings were free of heresy, as he believed, placing himself solidly and publicly in the same theological tradition as the Calabrian abbot would have rendered him suspect—not only in the eyes of Natalis and other Dominican Thomists, but from the viewpoint of many lectors still rooted in the Augustinian tradition, as well. On a more fundamental level, however, Durandus' choice of a historical model is particularly apt, for Joachim's attack on the Lombard's Trinitarian teachings was, in many ways, a "protest against a mode of theology" just as Durandus' own theology was a repudiation of the

Aristotelian and scientific elements in theology which were then best represented by the teachings of Aquinas.³⁸

Interestingly enough, the first step in Durandus' self-defense was to explicate the exact manner in which Joachim was an Arian but he was not.³⁹ In particular, Durandus argued that Joachim had been "truly an Arian" because he had posited that the three Persons were not "one" in essence and nature, unless as a collective being.⁴⁰ In comparison, Durandus assented to the shared essence of the Trinity. The second step in Durandus' self-vindication was to turn the tables on his former mentor by charging the Thomists with Sabellianism, the ancient heresy that the Persons of the Trinity describe nothing more than God's mode of dealing with the human mind.⁴¹ Indeed, Durandus would claim that, unless one believed in the real distinction, one risked falling into Sabellianism.⁴² This last allegation was based on Durandus' understanding that, implicit in the Lombard's argument (and in that of Aquinas and those who agreed with him), was the reference to a fourth person because there must be a divine essence which did not generate, was not generated and had not proceeded.⁴³

One of the most intriguing aspects of this sidebar discussion is the fact that Natalis did not spend most of his time defending his own teachings. Nor, although he does appropriate Aquinas' rebuttal of Joachim to correct Durandus' interpretation of Lombard, does he seem especially concerned with defending Peter Lombard's position.⁴⁴ Instead, Hervaeus answered Durandus' charge of Sabellianism, as well as his argument that the positing of a real distinction was necessary to avoid the heresy, by stating that his student's basic premise was false.⁴⁵ He added, parenthetically, that if one were to use the traditional, non-modalist definition of relation, Durandus' hypothesis would, indeed, be wrong by definition.⁴⁶ In addition to his refutations of Durandus' concept of relation, Natalis' rebuttals consisted largely of definitions and exegetical excursions into the texts promulgated by the Lateran Council.

Thus, inextricable from the historically centered side-debate just mentioned was its correlate which revolved around the canonical texts promulgated by the Lateran Council in 1215. Resulting from the debates over the teachings of Joachim of Fiore and Peter Lombard, an exegetical contest emerged between the two theologians over the "correct" interpretation of the *Decretals*. Perhaps the most striking thing about this exegetical skirmish was not the relative absence of Aquinas' theology nor the precise meanings which the two friar preachers assigned to the canonical texts, but their attitudes towards solving the problem. On the one hand, Durandus went to considerable lengths to explicate precisely what the council had meant to say and what it had not. But although Natalis took the time to correct his protegee's exegesis of the *Decretals*, the promulgations of the Council were not his primary concern. Instead, Natalis, alluding to the norms for the exegesis of texts laid down in Abelard's *Sic et Non*, replied that it was better to leave an question

unanswered than to provide a defective answer.⁴⁷ Indeed, Natalis argued, the human *viator* in this world is not provided with all of the evidence needed to arrive at either intellectual satisfaction or the full truth of divine mysteries.⁴⁸

Underpinning this exchange of accusations of heresy generated by the dispute over the two Dominicans' Trinitarian theology were a series of conflicting assumptions and attitudes which were interwoven throughout the controversies. The disagreement between the two theologians as to which questions should or should not be subjected to theological investigation revealed their disparate personalities, as well as discordant theological orientations. Contrary, perhaps, to the Augustinian and Thomist stereotypes now held by most scholars, Durandus was more than willing to explore whatever *terra incognita* into which his theories, pushed to their logical conclusion, took him and, in doing so, he freely applied a revisionist exegesis to historical texts of his theological predecessors. More importantly, his adventuresomeness rendered not only Aquinas' teachings, but the consensus of his Dominican brethren irrelevant. Reflecting a more earthly realism than is commonly associated with Thomist metaphysics, Natalis, on the other hand, was ill-disposed to either reduce the divine mysteries to solvable riddles or to depart from the safety of the Thomist consensus.

Under Natalis' charge, a wide assortment of opinions drawn from Durandus' teachings on both the generation of the Holy Spirit and the real distinction between the essence and relations of the Trinity, as well as his fundamental definition of relation as a mode of being, were censured by the Dominican commissions of 1313 and 1317. Mirroring the progress of Natalis' own polemics against his adventuresome protégé, the first syllabi of errors issued in 1313 was concentrated on the potentially heretical propositions contained in Durandus' writings. Two of the censured articles are particularly relevant to our present discussion. First, in article 6, Durandus' teachings on both the spiration of the Holy Spirit and the real difference in the divine essence are unequivocally condemned as heretical.⁴⁹ Second, in article 13, the commissioners consider Durandus' explanation of his teachings as contained in the second redaction of his commentary on the Sentences; and repute these explanations as being in error and *contra Augustinum*.⁵⁰

In contrast to the syllabus of errors condemned in 1313, which was restricted to those of Durandus' teachings which were unsafe in regard to faith and morals, the list of errors condemned by the commission of 1317 itemized Durandus' "singular opinions" which deviated from those of the Common Doctor. This second list differed from its predecessor in scope as well as aim: in many articles the commissioners not only provided their brethren with citations pointing to the correct opinions (located in the corpus of Thomas' writings) but explained why Durandus was wrong. Their explication was extensive: on the subject of Durandus' teachings on relations, applied to innumerable topics, are treated in articles 6 to 49. Striking chords of *deja vu*, many of these articles of censure echo Natalis' polemics against his former

student. Thus, in article 9, Durandus' theory of the real difference is declared to be against the commonly held doctrines, against the teachings of the Church as iterated in the decretal, *Dampnamus*, which condemned Joachim's teachings, and against Thomas.⁵¹ Similarly, article 14, which condemns Durandus' teaching on the spiration of the Holy Spirit, also contains several refrains which are identical to those contained in Natalis' polemics, in this case his *Correctiones*, as discussed above.⁵² Both lists were imposed on the Dominican Order by general chapters held the year following their composition. Although many ecclesiastical and theological forces propelled this shift in focus, it would seem that the Order of Preachers resorted to Aquinas' teachings as a panacea to cure heretical tendencies discerned in Durandus' thought. Lacking any other rebuttal to Durandus' heterodoxy, they reached for what was available: namely, the Thomistic refutations contained in the polemics of Hervaeus Natalis and his Thomist proteges.

THE DEBATE OVER COGNITION

Arising out of his noetic of man and reflecting the leitmotif of simplification within his thought, Durandus' theories of epistemology and cognition present us with a cornucopia of opinions which diverged radically from those taught by Aquinas and commonly held by his confreres. To some extent, Durandus' teachings on the various facets of human knowing and knowledge can be seen as part of the Augustinian backlash against Aquinas' Aristotelian-based theory of cognition unleashed by the Condemnations of 1277.⁵³ Following in the ideological wake of Henry of Ghent, Durandus prepared the ground for the future anti-Thomist discussions on cognition and epistemology later put forth by John Peter Olivi and Ockham. More relevant to our purposes, however, Durandus' writings comprise a sequel to the earlier Augustinian-based critiques of Thomas' psychology launched by Dietrich of Freiburg, Meister Eckhart and James of Metz.⁵⁴ Reciprocally, Natalis' counterattacks were part and parcel of an almost unified effort by the early Thomists to defend Aquinas' theory of cognition.⁵⁵

The purpose of this section parallels that on relations: namely, to discern the extent to which Aquinas' teachings lay at the heart of these debates. Although the disputes between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain over epistemological issues were but one component of their multidimensional conflict, the arguments which comprise these disputes and the polemical tracts in which they are embedded, are as dense and inter-tangled as a thicket. Instead of delving into the many branches which comprised these arguments, this section will highlight a few key questions in which the debates between Natalis and Durandus over the mechanics and process of knowing intersected with the respective Thomistic and Augustinian dimensions of their thought.

As with much of his theological thought, Durandus first presented his theory of cognition in the first redaction of his *In Petri Lombardi sententias*

theologicas commentariorum libri IIII. In a similar parallel to the history of Natalis' and Durandus' conflict over relation, their confrontation over the mechanisms and processes of human knowledge commenced with the latter's enrollment into an already-existing dispute, this time between Natalis and Henry of Ghent.⁵⁶ More specifically, the contention between Natalis and Durandus began with Durandus' refutations of Natalis' *De specie et intellectu* and *De verbum* in which Natalis' had defended Aquinas' teachings from Henry's polemical encroachments.⁵⁷ Reproducing the paradigm established in their conflict over relation, Durandus' did more than just defend Henry's ideas—he appropriated many of Henry's concepts and utterly radicalized them. Durandus then proceeded to use this radicalized rendition of Henry's theory to criticize the convictions of Aquinas and, more immediately but less directly, those of Natalis.

Durandus' simplification of the process of intellectual cognition entailed the wholesale obliteration of Thomas' cognitive theories. First, Durandus defined the act of knowing as a relation, or a mode of being, in which the intellect was presented, face to face, with the image of its object.⁵⁸ Second, although Aquinas had assigned a critical role to the agent intellect within his own cognitive theories, Durandus repudiated the need for an agent intellect because he believed it to be superfluous.⁵⁹ Third, Thomas had also held that intelligible species were an intrinsic part of the knowing process.⁶⁰ Yet, Durandus explicitly attacked this view.⁶¹ Fourth, Durandus denied the existence of universals, at least as Aquinas had understood them.⁶² For Durandus, the universal existed only as a local unit within the mind, it did not exist in things.⁶³ Moreover, Durandus held that acts of sensation and intellection were brought about by the causes that created and engendered the knower rather than by the object.⁶⁴ Clearly then, by discarding so many of the distinctions and intermediary faculties which characterized Thomas' cognitive theories, Durandus' own cognitive theory was fundamentally opposed to that of Aquinas and the early Thomists.

But the extent to which Durandus' theories of cognition and the process of knowing may or may not have been deliberate assaults on Aquinas' teachings is open to debate. At least one scholar has argued that the modern doctor's writings on intelligible species were nothing less than polemical assaults on Thomas' own texts on the same subject.⁶⁵ Yet, Hervaeus had also originally held that intelligible species were necessary.⁶⁶ Thus, the argument could be made that Durandus was attacking not Thomas, but his former mentor or the early Thomistic School in general.⁶⁷ In the case of intelligible species, this last hypothesis might hold true for the early years of his conflict with Natalis but not after 1314. Indeed, the conflict between the two Dominicans had caused Hervaeus to modify his own theory on intelligible species.⁶⁸ Thus, certain of Durandus' arguments, such as that on the species of color, were applicable to most, if not all, of Aquinas' followers, as well as to the Common Doctor, himself.⁶⁹ Other of Durandus' arguments, however, especially those in which

he gave full vent to his sarcasm, seem to have been leveled directly at Thomas. This is true of Durandus' dictum that it was absurd to believe that the "cognitive power is led to the cognition of something through a representation of which it is unaware."⁷⁰

In contrast to the rest of the polemics in which he championed the teachings of "blessed Thomas," the works in which Natalis supposedly defends Aquinas' cognitive theory reveal a of chinks of ambivalence in his Thomist armor. First, Natalis used Thomas' wordstock in this area to connote meanings and concepts which Aquinas would never have accepted.⁷¹ Second, as was just mentioned, Hervaeus departed from Aquinas' understanding of the role of intelligible species. Moreover, although his final rejection of the *species seems* to have the direct result of Durandus' arguments, he had never completely embraced the concept.⁷²

Yet, if Natalis' defense of Thomas' cognitive psychology was insipid in some areas it bordered on jealousy in others. This is especially true of his championing of the agent intellect.⁷³ Thus, Hervaeus took issue with Durandus' dual contentions that the agent intellect might not be supreme among the parts of the soul and might not, in fact, exist at all.⁷⁴ Indeed, Natalis argued that the agent intellect was a necessary principle in the process of knowing.⁷⁵ Second, in support of Thomas and in rebuttal of Durandus, Natalis argued that the act of knowing did add something to the intellect.⁷⁶ Certainly then, Hervaeus' rebuttals of Durandus were closer in spirit to the theories of Aquinas' than were those of his former pupil. Moreover, in those areas in which Natalis, himself, deviated from the Common Doctor, he, himself, was unaware of the differences. Instead, this subconscious dissent was merely one more example which revealed the extent to which many of Aquinas' early followers misunderstood his teachings.

Finally, if we were to step back from the syllogistic intricacies of the specific theses and arguments and look at the overall trajectories of the two Dominicans' metaphysics, the manner in which Natalis' and Durandus' debates over cognition reflects the broader clash between the Thomist and Augustinian traditions becomes readily apparent. Thus, Durandus' simplification of the cognitive process was in many ways a by-product of his own distrust of human reason. Preferring to found his positions on faith, this distrust of human reason was, to some extent, the mutual result of both his epistemology and his concept of theology.⁷⁷ To leave the safety of certitude of objective knowledge, or fact, and enter into speculative theology was, for Durandus, to posit hypotheses, not to arrive at truth.⁷⁸ Reciprocally, Natalis' defense of Aquinas' cognitive psychology and related teachings were, to some extent, not only an affirmation of Aquinas' own belief in the abilities of human reason but a cultivation of the developing Thomist tradition.⁷⁹

Although Natalis and the other early Dominican Thomists did not follow Aquinas' teachings on cognition in its specifics, they ensured the continuing circulation of these theories by itemizing and censuring the articles in which

Durandus had departed from them. These departures ranged from the most fundamental definitions, such as the thesis that the “act of knowledge was not something absolute but a relation, a *modus essendi* to the specific mechanics involved in the process of knowing, such as the role of the agent intellect, intelligible species and universals.⁸⁰ In part, these issues were important to Natalis, Durandus and their fellow Dominicans because, having been formed and trained as theologians, their theologies were focused on knowing and understanding God. As a result, they addressed questions about how humans come to know and the nature of the process by which knowing takes place precisely because they were concerned with establishing the theological boundaries around what could and could not be established by human reason.

THE DEBATE OVER THEOLOGY

Contrasted to their more volatile controversies over relations and cognition, the disputes between Natalis and Durandus over theology have received relatively little attention, even within the handful of works concerned with their contest.⁸¹ Similarly, although general works have often touched upon Natalis’ and Durandus’ contributions to the history of theology as individuals, their disputations over questions focused on the nature of theology, itself, have been largely bypassed.⁸² In part, this scholarly disregard for the debates over theology may have been prompted by want of direct evidence from the antagonists, themselves, as to their significance.⁸³ Compared to the innumerable *quaestiones* which comprised their controversies on relations and cognition, Natalis and Durandus exchanged relatively few polemics on the nature of theology, itself. Yet, irreconcilable concepts of theology permeated their whole of the conflict. In order to illuminate the manner in which their disparate views on theology underpinned their conflict, this section will delineate four aspects of Natalis’ and Durandus’ conceptions of theology: notably, those on the questions of the scientific status of theology; the nature of theology; its methodological procedures; and the scope of legitimate theological enquiry.

By the time that Natalis and Durandus began their public and much-publicized debates in 1307, theology had long since ceased being the exclusive preserve of scriptural exegesis.⁸⁴ With the introduction and assimilation of the newly translated Aristotelian corpus, the medieval concept of *sacra doctrina*, perceived as a body of knowledge derived from *Scripture*, slowly began to metamorphose into that of *theologia*, which was understood increasingly in terms of the much broader and more encompassing academic activities of the *theologi*.⁸⁵ Disputations and collations, as practiced in the Dominican schola, are but two examples of these new theological activities. Each differs from the pristine exegesis practiced within the earlier monastic tradition in that they involved the application of dialectical reasoning. One of the on-going scholastic quarrels which marked this transformation was the debate over the

proposition that *theologia* met the criteria of the Aristotelian definition of a *scientia*.⁸⁶

Aquinas' determination that *sacra doctrina* was a science, even though a subalternate science, and the critiques which these opinions received from Godfrey of Fontaines and Henry of Ghent have been thoroughly examined elsewhere.⁸⁷ Less well known, however, are the innumerable answers to Aquinas' critics put forward by the early Thomists and the role which that debate played in coalescing the cadre of Aristotelian-leaning scholastics into a recognizable school.⁸⁸ Indeed, beginning with the *Correctoria* controversies, the issue was a focal point of debate between Thomists and Augustinians right up until (and after) the quarrels between Natalis and Durandus. Relevant to our examination, Natalis had debated the scientific status of theology with Henry of Ghent and had discussed the finer points of the matter with James of Metz.⁸⁹ Thus, it is natural to suspect that Natalis and Durandus disagreed on the question of theology's status as a *scientia* and as a subalternate science. Curiously, however, in the prologues to their *Commentaries on the Sentences*, Natalis and Durandus reached similar, if subtly different, conclusions to these and other fundamental questions concerning theology.⁹⁰

Surprisingly, even if Durandus, himself, did not recognize the fact, his departure from Aquinas' concept of theology was not rooted in a fundamentally disparate definitions of theology. In the prologue to his *Commentaria in IV libros Sententiarum*, Durandus presented his readers with a brief lexicon of the three *habitus*, or intellectual predispositions, along with their attendant meanings and consequences, commonly associated with the term *theologia*. The first *habitus* which Durandus offered is that of theology as an assent to the contents of *Scripture*.⁹¹ Second, Durandus presented his own interpretation of theology as the *habitus* by which faith and *Scripture* was handed down, defended and explained.⁹² It is here, in his examination of the second sense of theology, that Durandus examines its status as a *scientia*. Using Henry of Ghent's attack on Thomas as a model (and even his choice of geometry as an example), Durandus argues that theology can't be a science because its corollaries with other real sciences break down upon examination.⁹³ Reflecting the Augustinian origins of Durandus' thought, these first two definitions retained the traditional meaning of theology as a block of knowledge. Thus, like many before and after him, Durandus believed that theology was an activity; namely, that of the supernaturally infused exercise of faith.⁹⁴ Examining each of his three definitions of theology in order, Durandus rejected theology's status as either a science or a subalternate science.⁹⁵ Because he held that theology was a mode of faith, Durandus' transliterated the question into whether or not faith could be a science and determined that it could not.⁹⁶

Durandus' consideration of his third definition of theology in its third sense as a *habitus* reveals a fundamentally anti-Thomistic leitmotif which was interwoven throughout most, if not all of the Prologue to his Commentary. In

this definition, Durandus examines theology as the activity by which conclusions are deduced from Sacred Scripture and the articles of faith.⁹⁷ Alluding to the growing practice within the Order of Preachers of calling Thomas the Common Doctor and also of referring to the beliefs of the Dominican Thomists as the common teachings, Durandus notes that this definition is “commonly held” but that he, himself, does not know if it is true. Clearly then, Durandus projected onto Aquinas and his early followers all the negative connotations associated with the professionalization of theology as an academic discipline. In fact, he says so explicitly.⁹⁸ Expanding on the Augustinian backlash against this “new” form of theology, Durandus repeatedly attacked many of these conventions. Referring to the growing prominence of Thomas’ *Summa*, he noted that many glosses contain errors which are dangerous to the faith.⁹⁹ For Durandus, the what to which the faithful were to adhere was determined by the contents of Scripture, alone.¹⁰⁰ For the instruction of the simple, extracts drawn from Scripture was all that was necessary, not, it should be noted, the handbooks or explanations then commonly produced by his Dominican brethren.¹⁰¹

Intrinsic to Durandus’ rejection of the scholastic custom of theology as practiced in the universities was a fundamental scepticism regarding the human ability to come to know God by means of reason. Thus, there could be no certitude with respect to the articles of faith, otherwise we would no longer be *viatores* but among the blessed. Similarly, humans were liable to Satanic deceptions. Finally, if there were a certitude regarding the articles of faith, there would be no merit in believing them.¹⁰²

As was the case in his championing of Aquinas’ cognitive theories, Natalis paradoxically attempted to defend a Thomistic conception of theology while simultaneously (if unknowingly) departing from Aquinas’ teachings on the matter. Like Durandus, Hervaeus also held that theology, broadly defined, was the *habitus* of faith or an assent to Revelation.¹⁰³ In the strict sense of the term, however, Hervaeus held that faith was distinguished from theology as theology was a “discursive habit which was different from both faith and science.”¹⁰⁴ Although Natalis believed that reasoning about data drawn from human authorities and reason were legitimate approaches to the end of theology, he considered this to be theology only in the broadest sense of the term.¹⁰⁵ But he does not accept the definition of theology which Durandus has attributed to him (and Aquinas); namely, that of the practice of theology as an academic discipline. Instead, Natalis holds that these activities are an annexure to theology.¹⁰⁶

Like Durandus, Natalis departed from Aquinas’ position that theology was a science and a subalternate science. Because Natalis held that theology was a primarily a belief in Revelation he held that theology was a science in a broad but not strict sense.¹⁰⁷ Similarly, Hervaeus rejected the status of theology as sub-alternate science.¹⁰⁸ Confronted with his departure from the Angelic Doctor, Natalis simply denied that Thomas had held that theology was a

subalternate science. Instead, he hypothesized that Thomas had simply tried to argue that theology bore some similarities to the sciences, classically defined.¹⁰⁹ Although Natalis may have been hazy about some aspects of Aquinas' concept of theology, he nevertheless advanced the Thomist cause by insisting on the legitimate role of reason as an auxiliary to faith in the theological endeavor. Thus, Natalis argued that reason assisted a person's efforts to believe what has been revealed.¹¹⁰

Inextricable from Natalis and Durandus' independent writings on the question of theology as a science were their more argumentative discussions over the questions of its unity or type; its character and its subject.¹¹¹ In each of these areas, the teachings of Durandus conflicted radically with those of Aquinas. Thus, while Aquinas had affirmed the unity of theology, Durandus did not. In fact, Durandus did not even include the question of the unity of theology in the prologue to his commentary on the *Sentences*, which was then common practice. Instead, beginning with his three definitions of the term, Durandus accorded theology a multiplicity of activities. Similarly, Thomas had taught that *sacra doctrina* was both speculative and practical. After having considered the question, Durandus transposes its meaning, arguing that *theologia* was not primarily speculative or practical but affective.¹¹² For, Durandus argued, the question of speculative and/or practical pertained to the intellect, whereas theology, because it was the equivalent to faith, pertained to the will. Third, Aquinas had maintained that the subject of theology was God under the aspect of his divinity and his relationship to his creatures. His much-removed successor at Paris, however, rejected this thesis, arguing that the subject of *theologia* was a work of merit. Ironically, one of Durandus' arguments against Thomas' teaching was that an idiot who achieved beatitude gained more merit than did a doctor in theology who did not.¹¹³

But if Durandus' prologue reads like a litany of Dominican dissent, Natalis' writings on theology, save for those pertaining to its status as a science and a subalternate science, adhere strictly to those of Aquinas. Thus, following Thomas' lead, Natalis, himself, held that *theologia* was primarily speculative and secondarily practical.¹¹⁴ Similarly, like Aquinas, Natalis held that God was the subject of theology.¹¹⁵ Moreover, he attacked the position of his former student, arguing that if theology was a work of human merit, then that was but one small part of it's total.¹¹⁶

Despite initial appearances, these disparate conceptions of theology were not drawn strictly according to party lines. Aquinas, Natalis and Durandus each shared the fundamental medieval conception of the theological method as being, more or less, that of Scriptural exegesis. They differed, however, as to the number and type of activities which they would allow to subsidize that effort. Many of these disagreements were over the tools which could be used to supplement exegesis, the role of reason in understanding Scripture and the customs by which tradition and Scriptural knowledge was to be handed down. For instance, Natalis defended the use of the Lombard's *Sentences* against

Durandus' attacks.¹¹⁷

One of the more fascinating peripheral discussions between Natalis and Durandus was that over the scope or limits of legitimate, and orthodox, theological enquiry. Both Dominicans recognized that there were limits as to what a theologian could or could not argue. Even Durandus had once commented that one should not always say what one thinks.¹¹⁸ But the two differed even in their approach to this fundamental question for Durandus emphasized theology's scope and Natalis its limits. Natalis' perception of limits to theological inquiry affected much of the history of his conflict with Durandus. In several passages scattered throughout his works, he explicates exactly what those limits were and to whom they applied.

One such instance is in Natalis' *Quolibet* II, q. 16, where he asked, "utrum magister in theologia tractans curiosas questiones et dimittens utiles ad salutem peccet moraliter?"¹¹⁹ Curiously, Hervaeus examined the cases of students and masters, finding the former to be guilty more often than the latter. Much depended upon context, intent and end result. Thus, Natalis lectured, if a student were to study the "pernicious arts" in order to confirm the faith or refute those things *contra fidem*, the act was meritorious.¹²⁰ However, should a student read in a prohibited subject without a license, he commits a sin.¹²¹ Some topics, such as geometry, are a matter of indifference, for their study results in neither merit nor demerit.¹²² Studies prompted by pride and vainglory are the occasions of sin and should be avoided.¹²³ Prompted by curiosity, *magistri* could also ask questions without mortal sin, especially if those questions were somehow useful. It is, according to Natalis, those questions which lead to error which are dangerous to their immortal souls.¹²⁴

Durandus' activities provoked Natalis to ruminate yet further upon the limits of theological discourse in his *Reprobationes excusationes Durandi*. In the *Reprobationes*, Natalis discusses what might or might not be legitimately disputed by theologians.¹²⁵ According to Natalis, the answer to this question depends upon the subject of the disputation. Elaborating on this point, Natalis divides subjects of disputations into three categories.¹²⁶ The first category of disputation are those subjects which have already been determined by the authority of Scripture and the Church.¹²⁷ Making a backhanded reference to his former protégée's teachings on relations, Natalis offers up the examples of the Trinity and the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son.¹²⁸ Natalis' second category consists of those articles which have not been determined by the authority of Scripture or the Church, but on which the majority of doctors and fathers favor one opinion or the other.¹²⁹ Here, Natalis gives the example of the question of whether the Resurrection occurred in the middle of the night or daybreak.¹³⁰ Classed by Natalis as matters "*indifferens*," the third category is comprised of those subjects which are not matters of faith and on which there are no commonly accepted opinions.¹³¹ Natalis seems to be referring primarily to theses of a purely philosophical or scientific nature,

for the example he gives here is the question of whether celestial and inferior bodies are composed of identical matter.¹³²

Theologians disputing theses related to articles of the faith, Natalis maintains, are not allowed to express a preference for the heretical proposition nor to question why the article held by the Church is true, for in such cases the authority of Scripture or the Church is sufficient reason in and of itself. If, however, a theologian cites such an opinion while remaining neutral, neither approving nor disavowing it, his argument should be considered incomplete rather than heretical.¹³³ In his third definition, Natalis granted that it was permissible for a theologian to hold whatever opinions he likes when disputing the third type of article, for they have not been decided by either the authority of Sacred Scripture or that of the Church.¹³⁴

In conclusion, therefore, it can be said that despite their diverse natures, these debates between Natalis and Durandus are tied together by at least three themes. First, despite Natalis' standing as *magister*, and later as provincial, Durandus initiated each of the aforementioned debates. In doing so, he extended and expanded upon many of the arguments used earlier during the *Correctoria* controversies. In many cases, he directly attacked arguments made by Natalis in defense of Thomas against non-Dominicans such as Henry of Ghent and Duns Scotus. Second, the main trajectories of Durandus' writings in regard to each of the topics examined above were fundamentally anti-Thomistic. Yet, Durandus seems to have been intent on developing his own eclectic synthesis: his dissent from Thomas was an accident of his theology, not its bedrock. Third, although Natalis' stated purpose in many of his polemics was the defense of Thomas' teachings, the arguments by which he sought to accomplish this purpose diverged radically from those of his idol.

Woven throughout the many polemical tracts penned by Natalis and Durandus was a central, and primary, preoccupation with the truth. This is not to say that the controversies were entirely free of petty partisan politics or *ad hominem* attacks: vitriol has rarely been engaged with so much dash and vigor. But the controversies were perennially substantial, focused primarily upon the issues at hand. When Durandus rejected the teachings of Aquinas, he did so, he would later claim, as a "friend of truth."¹³⁵ And he did so against a mentor who would later thunder against him that, even if the rocks at the bottom of the sea were never known by any person, they would still be true because they have an essence independent of any intellect.¹³⁶

Indeed, this same preferential focus on doctrinal teachings in the form of right doctrine or right teaching, remained a constant factor in the reactions of the Dominican hierarchy to Durandus' ideological transgressions. Thus, while articles extracted from Durandus' writings were censured and condemned, Durandus never was. The manner in which the Dominicans recorded the controversies reveal the same hierarchy of intellectual priorities. Less than twenty years after Aquinas' canonization, it mattered not to the Friar Preachers whether it was Natalis or Durandellus who had authored the

Evidentiae contra Durandum, so long as the perfidious doctrines were disproved.¹³⁷ Similarly, if, during the Renaissance, the Dominicans appropriated Durandus, along with his prestige, for their Thomist hall of fame, so much the better: it mattered not what Durandus had taught so long as the right doctrines were disseminated.¹³⁸ Not surprisingly, the Friar Preachers equated “right doctrines” with the teachings commonly held by the vast majority of their *magistri*. Finally, the conformity of many of these commonly held opinions with the teachings of the Common Doctor was to provide the impetus behind the establishment of Aquinas’ theological authority within the Order of Preachers in the early fourteenth century.

The Controversies and the Question of Aquinas' Theological Authority

THROUGHOUT THIS DISSERTATION, FREQUENT REFERENCE HAS BEEN made to the consensus among historians that the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain were a contributing factor to the Dominicans' embrace of Aquinas' teachings in the early fourteenth century. Yet to date, the only link which has been firmly established within the historiographical corpus has been that between the provocation of Durandus' writings and the legislative reaction of the general chapters in prohibiting further dissent from Thomas.¹ All other dimensions of the relationship between the two processes remain, for the most part, *terraincognita*. Exploring one small sector of this terrain, this chapter will chart the correlation between the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain and the concurrent process by which Aquinas was accorded a steadily increasing amount of *auctoritas* by the Order of Preachers.

To achieve this aim, this discussion is arranged into three segments, each addressing a set of relevant questions. In order to establish the framework for the subsequent two sections, the first segment will define and catalog the various ways in which medievals conceptualized the term *auctoritas*. By examining the standpoint of Natalis and Durandus vis-a-vis both the expansive spectrum of medieval authorities in general, as well as the more precise *auctoritas* of Aquinas, the second segment will help us to answer several significant questions. Most importantly, it will facilitate our efforts to roughly determine the extent to which the two antagonists were conscious of the relationship between their arguments and the consequent growth or retardation of Aquinas' *auctoritas*. Reciprocally, this examination will provide information as to how the issue of Aquinas' *auctoritas* affected the controversies. Concluding our argument, the third segment evaluates the evolution and genus of Aquinas' *auctoritas* within the Order prior to, during and after the controversies; thereby assessing the influence which the extended conflict between Natalis and Durandus had on that Aquinas' *auctoritas*.

MEDIEVAL CONCEPTIONS OF THEOLOGICAL AUTHORITIES

In the previous chapter, our analysis of the debates between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain was performed within the context of examining their arguments vis-a-vis the relationship of those polemical disputes to Aquinas' teachings, not his *auctoritas* either within or outside of the Order of Preachers. The substance of Thomas' teachings, as understood by his contemporaries and subsequent generations, did contribute to the wellspring of his growing *auctoritas*. But for Natalis, Durandus and their Dominican brethren, (and, indeed, for all medievals), the term *auctoritas* referred to a "text, or to the prestige of a writer behind that text."² Thus, unlike its predecessor, this chapter is concerned with Aquinas' *auctoritas* in two narrowly defined senses of the word: namely, that which was accorded to certain of his texts; and that which was accorded him as the author of those texts.³

Having originally evolved out of the Latin verb *ago*, *agere*, the noun *auctoritas* was accorded a rich and multifarious assortment of meanings and nuances throughout the ancient and medieval periods which varied according to record or document, context and era.⁴ The same is true of its lexicographical siblings, *auctor*, its synonym *autor*, and the much less exalted *actor*. Originally, *auctor* referred to the initiator of an act, most often of a legal proceeding. Similarly, within Roman civil law, the noun *auctor* served as the technical designation for a plaintiff. Likewise, in common law, *auctor* denoted the seller of a right, prerogative or claim which he certified was authentic, while the term *auctoritas* meant the guarantee, itself. In contrast, *actor*, having arisen out of the stem *ab augeo*, carried with it more mechanical associations, designating a driver, a doer of an action, a performer or an administrator.⁵

Not surprisingly, each of these terms acquired a number of connotations during antiquity which they carried with them through the middle ages. *Auctor* was always a weightier term than was *actor*, connoting power, veracity, dignity and prestige in a way that the latter term did not. Moreover, *auctor* retained its legal reference to the idea of a witness: scholastics often invoked the names of *auctores*, calling upon them to give testimony as to the truths of their propositions. In its classical sense, *auctoritas* referred to a single *opinio* or *sententia*.⁶ One does not find references to plural *auctoritates* until the ninth century after which time both the term and the concept were widespread. Unlike *actor*, both *auctoritas* and *auctor* have been linked to *authenticis*, thereby pointing to the concept of origin.⁷

By the thirteenth century, each of these terms had undergone innumerable, if oftentimes subtle, transformations. Aquinas often used the term *auctor* to refer to teachers, as well as to authors and originators.⁸ Usually, however, *auctor* denoted someone who was not only an author but also an authority.⁹ Indeed, for a text to be considered authoritative, it had to have been penned by

an *auctor*. Reciprocally, for a writer to have been regarded as an *auctor*, he had to have penned at least one authoritative text.¹⁰ Similarly, in the university classrooms, students were often appointed to the role of *actor*, recording the *quaestiones* of their *magister*.¹¹ More often, however, the word *actor* denoted a scribe or a *compiler* of sources or authors.¹² At times, *actor* could be used as a term of disparagement or disapproval. For instance, Aquinas habitually applied the term *actor* to Avicenna and Averroes within the context of disproving one of their arguments. Similarly, Thomas withheld the status of *auctor* from Peter Lombard on many points because he considered those specific passages unauthentic.¹³ By implication, then, Lombard was merely the *actor*, not the *auctor*, of the spurious excerpts. The difference is also illustrated in the more infamous and less charitable passages penned by Roger Bacon when he balked at the authority accorded Albert the Great and Alexander of Hales in Paris.¹⁴ Yet, perhaps the best definition of the term *auctor* is that given by Bonaventure, "... aliquis scribit aliena addendo, sed sua tamquam principalia, aliena tamquam annexa ad confirmationem, et debet dici auctor."¹⁵

Several ingredients were necessary for a text or its author to be accorded *auctoritas*. First, and most obviously, the authoritative text had to possess some intrinsic worth. In other words, it had to be worthwhile. Secondly, and equally apparent, the text (and, more generally, its author) had to conform to Christian truth.¹⁶ But, considering the medieval predilection for forgery, there was also the unanticipated criterion that the text be both attributable and authentic. Apocryphal works were perceived to be far inferior to texts which bore the name of its author. Thus, Aquinas showed particular concern for the authenticity of his sources, rejecting those, such as the *De spiritu et anima* then popularly accredited to Augustine, whose authorship he suspected of being spurious.¹⁷ Similarly, Humbert of Romans also troubled himself with the question of disputed authorship.¹⁸ In point of fact, a concern for authenticity, as well as a surprising precision in the citation of sources, seems to have been a particularly Dominican leitmotif.¹⁹ Hence, the manner in which the *auctoritates* were presented in the Dominican lectionary. A further requirement, in practice if not in theory, was that the text or author be recognized as such within the community in question. This last criterion necessitated at least two other characteristics. First, both the text and its author had to be well known which, in turn, meant that enough copies had to be in circulation to ensure the authority's reputation. Related to this last qualification, the manner and extent to which a text was used determined whether it was acknowledged as an *auctoritas*, as well as the type of authority accorded it. The most spectacular example of this last criterion is the adoption and employment of documents within the schools. By the simple virtue of its being the subject of a *lectio*, a text became authoritative.

Thus, classroom texts generally possessed a far greater *auctoritas* than those texts or authors not lectured upon. Basically, there were two groups of classroom texts: the *auctoritates*, themselves; and the authoritative

commentaries by which the lectors taught and the students learned the subject matter contained in the *auctoritates*. By the middle ages, the canon of the first group, the *auctoritates*, was relatively stable, widely recognized and rarely changed. Among others, these included selected texts of Donatus and Priscian for grammar; Cicero and Quintilian for rhetoric; and Porphyry, Aristotle and Boethius for dialect. For law, the most widely recognized text was Gratian. In theology, *Sacred Scripture* and the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard. In contrast, syllabi of magisterial commentaries employed within the *schola* proved to be much more elastic, contracting and expanding according to discipline and time period.²⁰ Throughout the middle ages, the first group always possessed more authority; and a more distinctive type of authority than did the second. Both groups enjoyed their own internal hierarchies, although the exact placement within these hierarchies of any given *auctoritas* varied according to time, place and the specific topic under discussion.

For the most part, the perception and use of *auctoritates* by the *theologi* mirrored that of the artists, lawyers and grammaticians, with two exceptions. First, theologians were always willing to reject an *auctoritas* outright if it was judged to be incorrect or irrelevant to the purpose at hand, especially if that purpose was pastoral in nature.²¹ Second, barring those instances when an *auctoritas* was rejected outright, the theological authorities were more exalted; indeed, nearly impregnable from the assaults by reason, than were their conceptual clones in other disciplines.²² Aside from these two exceptions, however, medieval theologians possessed the same basic assumptions, concerns and beliefs regarding their authorities as did the scholastics of other faculties. Like the *auctoritates* in other fields, theological authorities connoted some form of warranty. Within the discipline of theology, the authoritative value of an *auctoritas* hinged up the extent to which it was recognized as having been guaranteed by the Church as being infallible or of being free of error.²³ Similarly, the themes of authorship, authenticity and provenance were also present and, perhaps, even amplified.

Finalizing the paradigm, medieval theologians also used the concept of an *ordo testimoniorum*, or the hierarchy of *auctoritates*, by which to conceptualize and apply their authorities. Indeed, there were hierarchies within each echelon of the *ordo testimoniorum* of theological authorities. In medieval theology, the three basic tiers of *auctoritates* were comprised of Scripture, the Fathers of the Church, and secular, or non-Christian, authors. Appended to this three-tiered hierarchy of authorities from the beginning of the thirteenth century on was a fourth echelon, consisting of the medieval theologians, themselves. Although each of these groups of authorities shared the common themes described above, there were nuanced and, at times, technical differences as to how medievals both understood and employed them.

As is to be expected, at the pinnacle of the medieval *ordo testimoniorum* was *Sacra Scriptura*. The authority of Scripture was guaranteed by the common belief that God was its *auctor*.²⁴ God was the instigator and guarantor of

revelation. After the dissemination of Aristotelian terminology and concepts, scholastics would put it another way: the authority of Scripture was irreproachable because God was its primary efficient cause.²⁵ Even within the scriptural canon, individual books of the Bible were conceptualized in a hierarchical manner. Thus, books of the New Testament were theoretically accorded a greater authority than those of the Old.²⁶ So too, in theory if not always in practice, was more authority accorded to the Gospels than to the Epistles.

The second tier of *auctoritates* within theology consisted of the *auctoritates patrum*. Although medievals placed the Church Fathers in a class of their own, their writings, believed to be inspired by the Holy Spirit, were considered essential for the understanding and interpretation of Scripture. As was true of the other echelons in the authoritative hierarchy, patristic authors were themselves divided into various levels of authority. Some, such as Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose and Hilary, were assigned an *auctoritas* of near-biblical proportions in some areas of theological enquiry. Others, such as John Chrysostom or the Greek Fathers, were relegated to a somewhat lower rank.

Two long-term trends emerge from the experience of patristic authorities throughout the ancient and medieval periods. First, during the ancient period, membership in the group expanded. None of the Church Fathers had possessed *auctoritas* during the Patristic period. In fact, most were open to criticism, if not outright attacks, during their lifetimes, often from future fellow *auctoritates*, as is witnessed by the now-infamous exchanges between Jerome and Augustine. The same is true of textual *auctoritates*. It took time for written works to be copied, circulated and discussed, which were prerequisites for any text to become an *auctoritas*. Second, the manner in which patristic figures acquired their authority established a paradigm which would be repeated by their medieval successors. As the most prominent of the medieval *auctoritates*, Augustine serves as a case in point. During his lifetime, Augustine's authority was derived from two sources: his ecclesiastical position as bishop and the respect accorded him due to his reputation as a holy man.²⁷ But his posthumous *auctoritas*, understood in the technical sense, rested upon his reputation for having lead a moral and upright life and the authority generated by his written texts. Reflecting the textualization of Christianity, *auctoritas*, as we are dealing with it here, never traveled on the sound waves of oral tradition and was therefore not extended to illiterates, no matter how piously they may have lived out their lives.

The *auctoritates philosophorum* comprised the third echelon of this hierarchy. Obviously the principal figure among these was Aristotle, although the group also included Plato, Cicero and others. As was the case of Scripture and the Church Fathers, the membership of this group remained relatively static throughout the middle ages. For the vast majority of scholastics, the authority of these non-Christian philosophers was unchallenged in philosophy and near-universal, if theoretically subordinate to Scripture and patristic

authorities in theology. Yet, as has been often noted, the authority of these philosophers, especially Aristotle, was often challenged by the more conservative churchmen and scholastics in the Augustinian tradition throughout much of the thirteenth century.

What have not been so thoroughly examined, however, are the attacks on the *auctoritas* of Aristotle and on that of certain Aristotelian-oriented scholastics during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. John Peter Olivi, for example, complained repeatedly that there was insufficient reason to follow Aristotle's lead in some areas and decried the *auctoritas* accorded the philosopher.²⁸ In many respects, the cries of Olivi and his cohort echo the grievances voiced by Roger Bacon two generations earlier but with one very fundamental difference: the traditionalists of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries used reason, not appeals to authority, to attack what they perceived as Aristotelian extremism.

In the twelfth century, the established triadic schema in which scriptural, patristic and ancient authorities had been hierarchically arranged gave way to a "more complex structure in which the *moderni* themselves had a place."²⁹ Depending on the context, the term *moderni* usually referred either "to an immediately preceding or to an almost contemporaneous generation of masters."³⁰ The *auctoritas* of the *magistri* seem to have come from several sources: most directly, from the ecclesiastical imprimatur place upon their teachings activities in the form of their license to teach.³¹ Ultimately, magisterial authority was derived from the masters' proficiency in the authoritative texts upon which they had lectured. In other words, the task of transmitting the Christian tradition, via the activities which defined them as *theologi* (e.g., defining terms, exegeting texts and determining questions), instilled within the *magistri* an authority all their own.³² Although contemporary and near-contemporary scholastics were usually referred to as either "*quidam*" or "*alii*," the auditors of the lecture or disputation and the contemporary readers of the text were usually aware of the identity of the author being referred to.³³ Moreover, scribes and editors routinely identified these *quidams* in the marginalia of texts, lest future readers have any doubt.³⁴ In general, the *dicta magistrorum*, or the teachings of the masters, had no constraining value. Thus, Aquinas had no problem in pointing out that Hugh of St. Victor, as a *magister*, did not have *auctoritas*.³⁵ But this did not mean that the *dicta magistrorum* were automatically subordinated to or rejected in favor of Scriptural and patristic authorities. Instead, scholastics employed a more complicated process in which the *auctoritates*, in terms of both their content and authorship, were taken into consideration.

During the early- to mid-thirteenth century, scholastics usually confined this newly accorded magisterial *auctoritas* to the *antiqui*, or to *magistri* who had flourished two or three generations before the writer.³⁶ Thus, Alexander of Hales, who was the first to use the texts of Anselm of Canterbury as an *auctoritas* on par with the Church Fathers, did not accord a similar authority

to his contemporaries.³⁷ Likewise, Bonaventure accorded some medieval sources, such as members of the Victorine school, with the same authority he did patristic sources, but did not extend this favor to the *moderni*, or to masters of the immediately preceding or almost contemporaneous generation.³⁸

By the late thirteenth century, however, there is evidence that some *moderni* consciously attempted to establish themselves and their contemporaries as authorities. Commentaries on texts written by the *moderni* began to appear. At times, some writers even produced commentaries on texts which they, themselves, had written.³⁹ The peculiarly medieval practice of bequeathing and employing honorific titles, such as *Doctor Eximii*, flourished.⁴⁰ Miniature portraits of authors began to appear in books and texts at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Some writers went to elaborate lengths to establish themselves as authorities. For example, Dante consciously imbued his self-portrayal with those characteristics and virtues necessary to be regarded as an *auctoritas*.⁴¹

It is within this context that the much-noted late medieval “fad” of ‘putting down’ authorities should be understood.⁴² If scholastics no longer regarded themselves as either dwarfs standing on the shoulders of giants or monks sitting at the feet of the Fathers, it may well be because the cast of *auctoritates*, themselves, had changed. For that matter, so too had the scholastics. As was noted in the previous chapter, fourteenth-century intellectuals were not only more accepting (if not desirous) of novelty, the university treadmill of preferment propelled many bachelors and *magistri* to adopt increasingly innovative positions. Moreover, the questions which they asked and the tools by which they answered them differed profoundly. In addition, the manner in which scholastics approached questions had changed: by the fourteenth century, “priority, not primacy,” was given to “the *cognitio rei particulis*.”⁴³ Intriguingly, those who attacked the *auctoritas* of certain *auctores* tended to be, if not Augustinians, then at least strong traditionalists who yearned to shield theology from the dangers of Aristotelian dialectic and return it to what they believed was its true Scriptural foundation.

Closely aligned to the issues of magisterial authority and tradition was that of the *auctoritas* enjoyed by the consensus of the magisterial community or faculties, especially that of the Dominican *magistri*. Although Natalis continually and Durandus occasionally appealed to the *doctrina communis* to support their arguments, their appeals differed in tone, tempo, context and meaning. On the broader stage of salvation, medievals conceptualized the norm of the faith, or those truths to which all Christians had assented, in terms of a *consensus communis*.⁴⁴ This leitmotif of consensus played a major role within more narrow contexts, such as that of the community of *magistri*.⁴⁵ The most common manifestation of this type of *auctoritas* were theses assented to by the members of specific faculties, such as the theology faculty at Paris which, as was noted in our second chapter, not only judged doctrine and right belief but wielded tremendous power by deciding ecclesiological and

church-state disputes. But even the Parisian *magistri* did not possess absolute authority. Bernard of Lombardy reported that Aquinas felt free to disagree with the unanimous opinion of the Paris masters regarding the distinction between *esse* and *essentia*.⁴⁶ But most relevant to our purposes is the authority which was located in the commonly-held opinions within a religious order or, more often, among its *magistri*.

Considered as a group, *auctoritates* were used by medieval theologians to achieve a number of goals and, as a result, were employed in a variety of ways. First, scholastics drew upon authorities to support their own arguments or to disprove those of their opponents. To accomplish this aim, less adept scholastics would at times excerpt quotations from authoritative texts without regard to authorial intent, prompting Alan of Lillie's infamous quip that authority like a wax nose, and hence could be turned in any direction.⁴⁷ In other instances, the internal logic of these arguments was sufficient to prove the author's theses, making the use of authorities seem superfluous. But, in these cases, authorities were employed to verify the scholastic's conclusion and to confirm that the contents of his own text was well within the Christian tradition. Thirdly, and somewhat obviously, scholastics used authorities to educate. Fourthly, scholastics tapped their spectrum of *auctoritates* to illumine the meanings of their texts, lectures and sermons. Finally, yet another use of *auctoritates* was as symbolic fathers, models or exemplars whose thought, attitudes or lives the auditors or readers were exhorted to emulate.⁴⁸ Thus, Natalis, as Master General, would exhort his *fratres communes* to study the Apostle Paul so that by studying his writings and his life, they would become like him.⁴⁹

As was true of so many aspects of scholasticism, *auctoritates* were adapted and adopted by religious orders in order to achieve their own objectives. Each religious institute had its own lists of censured and approved authors. Censorship took a variety of forms, ranging from general prohibitions to read, study or lecture upon specific authors to restrictive measures concerning the manner in which they could be read. Examples of the first instance the early prohibitions common to all of the mendicant orders against the study of the arts, as well as later proscriptions against meddling in alchemy. At times, an order would prohibit the study of a specific author. For instance, in the mid-fourteenth-century, the works of Thomas of Strassbourg would inspire the Augustinians to ban the study of Ockham.⁵⁰ But more often efforts at censorship were only partial. As was noted in the second chapter, following the Condemnations of 1277, Franciscans were admonished to supplement their texts of Aquinas' *Summa* with copies of William de la Mare's *Correctorium*.⁵¹ Similarly, beginning sometime after 1314, those Dominicans who did read Durandus were expected to do so with copies of the two syllabi of errors in hand.⁵² One of the ways in which they followed this instruction is illustrated by an extant fifteenth-century Spanish manuscript which contains a copy of books III and IV of the third redaction of Durandus' *In Petri Lombardi*

sententias theologicas commentariorum libri IIII. In this manuscript, relevant *extractio* drawn from the syllabus of 1314 are noted, neatly but prominently, in the margins.⁵³ All things considered, however, censorship within the orders was relatively rare: much more common was the imposition of texts and authors.

Within the four major medieval mendicant orders, “approved doctors” played much the same role as did their censored counterparts: namely, they served as a firewall against heresy, cultivated doctrinal cohesion, established a homogeneity among the order’s *schola*, and facilitated unity among the brethren. In the case of the Order of Preachers, the seeds of their tradition of “approved doctors” went back to the writing of their primitive constitution and were used to nurture the formation of their younger students.⁵⁴ Except for the relatively libertine Carmelites, each of the orders promoted the study of approved doctors.⁵⁵ Thus, the constitutions promulgated by Benedict XII mandated that friar minors read only the *Sentence* commentaries of “*approbati doctores*.”⁵⁶ Although most such promotions were universally applied by the general chapters, there were some regional variations. For instance, the Dominican province of Provence promoted the *auctoritas* of Peter of Tarentaise and Albert the Great in addition to that of Thomas.⁵⁷ Another variant in the mendicant orders’ exploitation of the *approbati doctores* contributed to the genesis of the schools of thought. Hence, the Augustinians mandated that their members lecture on and study the writings of Giles of Rome.⁵⁸ Yet, the *auctoritas* of their favorite sons was not the primary concern of the mendicant hierarchies. Nor did they accept the literary corpses of their leading lights uncritically. Instead, they searched and sifted through these masters’ commentaries and *quaestiones*, promoting some texts and quietly burying others. This point is further illustrated by the attitude of the mendicant hierarchies to the writings of bachelors and lesser-known authors. Minor authors from other orders were often appropriated and inserted into lectionaries under the anonymous “*quidam*.”⁵⁹ Thus, the significance of these actions lay in the teachings contained in the *auctoritates* championed by the orders; not in the identity of the *auctoritates*, themselves.

NATALIS’ AND DURANDUS’ CONCEPTS OF AUCTORITAS

Natalis’ and Durandus’ ongoing feud was stoked by irreconcilable and deeply held theologies, not by the issue of Aquinas’ *auctoritas*. Yet, as was pointed out in the previous chapter, Thomas’ *auctoritas* was at issue in each and every one of their disputes. But, if we limit our consideration to the effects of the controversies within the Order of Preachers, so too were other types of *auctoritas*, ranging from that of the Dominican hierarchy to the commonly held opinions of the Dominican *magistri* to that of Natalis and Durandus,

themselves. Clearly then, these other types of authority influenced both the manner in which Aquinas' *auctoritas* was an issue and the significance with which it was regarded by Natalis, Durandus and their Dominican brethren.

With regard to the authority to be accorded to the institutional Church, Natalis located an immense authority within the institutional Church and its tradition. Thus, for Natalis, faith was that by which people believed in Christ and in those things which were believed by the Church.⁶⁰ Heretics are such because, not holding close to the articles of faith and the contents of Scripture, as determined by the Church, they have drifted from the truth onto another route.⁶¹ For Natalis, the Church and its tradition combine to fill in the lacunae of things not found in Scripture. As he points out, Christ did and said many things which were not recorded in the Bible, yet this fact alone is not sufficient to discard those teachings and practices implemented by the Church.⁶² Contradicting his mentor by implication, Durandus held that nothing ought to be added to Sacred Scripture. If what little was contained in Scripture was not adequate enough to increase the faith, instruct the simple or dispute heretics, one should have recourse to the Creed.⁶³

Perhaps the type of *auctoritas* which exerted the most indirect influence upon the two antagonists' theologies was that of ecclesiastical authority. Yet, because the manner in which Natalis and Durandus understood ecclesiastical authority determined the outer limits of their activities as both Dominicans and theologians, the issue of ecclesiastical authority sheds some light on how they, themselves, understood their polemics and their consequences. Tangential to the topics covered in the previous chapter are two instances in which aspects of the antagonists' attitudes toward various modes of ecclesiastical authority became entangled with the central theses of debate.

The first of these side debates revolved around their disparate interpretations of the decree, "*Damnamus*," in which the Fourth Lateran Council condemned the Trinitarian theology of Joachim of Fiore. Whereas Natalis was content to take the condemnation at its face value, Durandus distinguished between the wording of the decree; the intent of the Council and the manner in which the decree was commonly understood. Implicit in Durandus' arguments is a belief that adherence to the decretals was a matter of personal discretion. Equally intriguing is Durandus' treatment of the conflict between Joachim and Lombard; which he prefaces with the claim that his intent was merely to recite the doctrines of Joachim and Lombard.⁶⁴ Ironically, like Thomas before him, Durandus attributed Joachim's error to ignorance.⁶⁵ Durandus pointed out that, just because a person held one thesis *contra fidem*, that did not mean that he had erred regarding other conclusions of faith; nor did it mean that he had repudiated his faith.⁶⁶ A sense of tolerance, perhaps even permissiveness, pervades much of Durandus' treatment of both Joachim's Trinitarian thought and the article which condemned it. It would seem that whatever inquisitorial duties he might have been called upon to perform, he was a medieval proponent of academic freedom.

Only one of the many *quaestiones* raised by either of the two men during their extended quarrel is centered directly upon the issue of ecclesiastical authority: the question raised by Durandus in his first *Quolibet Avenionense* on whether a monk or religious was more obligated to obey religious superior than the pope or local bishop.⁶⁷ In the *quaestio*, Durandus states that there are two opinions on the matter. The first, which was that of Natalis, answered in the affirmative, arguing that the religious was obligated to obey his superior by virtue of his vow of obedience.⁶⁸ Durandus rejected this claim, arguing that the vows of obedience only extended so far as to the rule and legitimate statutes of the order.⁶⁹ Thus, he opined, the authority of a religious superior was limited to such issues as remaining in the cloister, singing in choir, maintaining silence and suchlike.⁷⁰ In contrast, the pope had the authority to dispense anyone, lay or religious, from any vows, whether the vows of profession or those of marriage.⁷¹ According to Durandus, the pope's authority to intervene between a religious and his or her superior was limited only by the proviso that he do so for the good of the universal Church.⁷² Citing Bernard, Durandus further argued that a monk could legitimately disobey both pope and abbot to avoid transgressing against his vows, the legitimate statutes and his duties to Christ.⁷³

Particularly illuminating of the immediate context in which the *quaestio* was written is Durandus' argument that a monk, if called out of the cloister by the pope for the purpose of serving as papal legate, the monk was obliged to obey, even if that meant disobeying his superior.⁷⁴ In 1314, Hervaeus Natalis was provincial of the French province (of which Durandus was a member) and, despite the younger theologian's appointment as *magister in sacri palii*, was still his former protégé's religious superior. Moreover, the commission of 1313 had already issued the first syllabi of censored articles taken from Durandus' *In Petri Lombardi sententias theologicas commentariorum libri VIII*. Finally, Durandus was still a good two years away from the 1316–17 appointment as papal legate which would eventually propel him into an episcopal see, thereby liberating him from the yoke of Dominican discipline.

In such a context, the question of Durandus' intended audience is both intriguing and relevant. Although such a position may have been pleasing to the pope, Clement VI was hardly the man to inspire such dramatics. Moreover, Durandus would have had little or nothing to gain: as was typical of most early fourteenth-century Thomists, Natalis, Peter of Palude and John of Naples were all staunch papalists.⁷⁵ Thus, Durandus, in using such arguments, could not have intended to contrast himself favorably as more "paplist" than his judges, although this may indeed have been the case.⁷⁶ Nor could he have been appealing to the anti-Thomist camps among the seculars.⁷⁷ Even less likely was an appeal to members of other mendicant orders: the Augustinians and Carmelites were divided along much the same lines as were the Dominicans and the antipapal sentiments of the Spirituals had by this time infected most of their Franciscan brethren. Yet another possibility is that

Durandus was appealing to his own followers within the Dominican Order. There is some evidence that younger friars did adopt Durandus' theories, as well as his attitude. In addition to the measures taken by the general and provincial chapters to protect their members from contamination, there are also records of friars being censured for including Durandus' theses in their lectures and defending Durandus' innovations in their disputations. Of these, the most brazen was Ubertus Guidi, who was an assistant lector at the Florentine convent: he attacked Aquinas' teachings in disputation in front of an audience which was comprised not only of friars and seculars but members of the laity, as well, thereby publically embarrassing his lector and Thomas' former pupil and faithful disciple, Remigio de Girolami.⁷⁸

If Durandus did direct the *quaestio* at the Dominican commission, itself, he did so in the spirit of thumbing his nose at them. Throughout both the Parisian and Avignonese quodlibets, as well as the second redaction of his commentary, which he wrote to excuse and defend his recently censured positions, the young friar repeatedly insulted the board of inquiry. In other instances, he postured for a non-Dominican audience and portrayed himself as the victim of his inquisitors. For instance, one manuscript has him complaining that whoever did not agree with their definition of Pelagianism was called an idiot.⁷⁹ In another instance, he states that, "Teneamus, ergo, rem, quae ab omnibus tenetur communiter; et verbosi, contentiosi, calumniosi et malitiosi homines disputent de nominibus."⁸⁰ Certainly, his words, if not his specific arguments, suggest that he recognized neither the authority of Natalis, as his provincial, to censure his theology nor that of the Dominican commission to judge it. Of course, this is not to say that Durandus rejected all such boards of inquiry as a matter of principle: he sat on several such boards, himself, and had no problem with pronouncing upon the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of the articles of others.⁸¹

Natalis' and Durandus' attitudes toward textual *auctoritates* diverged far more than did their attitude towards ecclesiastical authority. As was true of all scholastics of the time, both Natalis and Durandus conceptualized their *auctoritates* in terms of a hierarchy and within that hierarchy accorded an unassailable primacy to Sacred Scripture. Beyond that, Natalis accorded far more *auctoritas* to non-Scriptural authorities than did Durandus.⁸² First, Hervaeus cited non-scriptural authorities often and drawn from through out the patristic and medieval spectrums. His quodlibets are full of references to Athanasius, Hilary, Jerome, Augustine, Boethius, Anselm, the Lombard and the Victorines. Second, Natalis recognized a link between the authority of Scripture and that of "*dictis communibus sanctorum et doctorum*," often coupling the two in his arguments.⁸³ For Hervaeus, the relationship between the two lie in the fact that these authorities constituted the intellectual tradition of Church; explained its teachings and practices; and explicated the revealed matter contained in Scripture which, without them, would have remained inaccessible.⁸⁴

On the whole, Durandus was relatively uninterested in the Church Fathers and disinclined to take the scholastic authorities seriously when it did not suit him.⁸⁵ In fact, Durandus' most infamous proclamation was that, "any man who leaves reason for human authority falls into bestial senselessness."⁸⁶ Yet, in some of his works he drew freely and often from the patristic repository. Although he did not believe that any one of the Church Fathers should be exalted above the others, he cited Augustine more often than any other *auctoritas*, save, perhaps, Sacred Scripture and Aristotle. Yet, he used Augustine's own texts to discourage the exaltation of the Bishop of Hippo, or of any other *auctor*, to the authoritative heights of Scripture. Indeed, the young *magister* believed that preference should always be accorded to reason over that of any human authority, no matter who the authority in question was: truth would elude those who relied too heavily on the authority of doctors, however celebrated or solemn.⁸⁷

Reflecting their disparate views on the relationship between faith and reason, the two theologians also held irreconcilable views on metaphysics and the *auctoritas* of Aristotle. For Natalis, there are of course limits as to what Aristotle and his philosophy can do: it is not possible to attain the truths of revelation by natural investigation alone.⁸⁸ A true disciple of St. Thomas, however, Natalis provided reason with a greater role within the theological endeavor than did Durandus. Thus, Hervaeus allows reason to assent to and illumine the truths contained in revelation.⁸⁹ But although theology uses that which has been found through metaphysics, it does so only when and because it affirms its first principles, i.e., the articles of faith.⁹⁰ Natalis' acceptance of metaphysics as an ancillary to theology both confirmed and set down the parameters for the *auctoritas* which he accorded Aristotle: he freely and frequently appealed to the Philosopher in matters pertaining to logic, natural philosophy and metaphysics, but never on issues of faith.

If Natalis followed the lead of Aquinas in his attitudes towards Aristotle, then Durandus followed that of Henry of Ghent and Peter Aureole. Like them, he appropriated the terminology, concepts and dialectical method from the ancient Greek. But he also followed their lead in discarding many of the basic Aristotelian elements, such as universals and intelligible species, which made Thomism what it was. This is not to say that Durandus rejected Aristotle.⁹¹ In fact, he seems to have drawn parallels between Aristotle's search for the truth and his own, pointing out that natural philosophy was concerned not with that which Aristotle had understood but with the truth of things. Thus, Durandus argued, whoever clung onto Aristotle's teachings or *auctoritas* too tightly, fell into error because he did not love truth as much.⁹²

Unlike Natalis, Durandus rarely appealed to the authority of the *antiqui et moderni*. In the works examined for this dissertation, there are only three cases in which Durandus cites the works of medievals who lived after Boethius in support of his own arguments; his use of the arguments of Joachim and Lombard in his disputes on relations; Bernard in his writings on the religious

life and within the context of the abbot's argument against Gilbert of Poitiers and himself.⁹³ Indeed, for the most part, Durandus' repertoire of *auctoritates* seems to have been that of a conservative early thirteenth-century scholastic. In this general abstention from using magisterial *auctoritates*, Durandus placed himself squarely within the conservative, Augustinian tradition of Kilwardy and before him, of Robert Bacon.

Terminology, especially word play, performed a major role in Natalis' efforts to strengthen the bonds of identity between the doctrines of Thomas and those of his Order. As French provincial, as well as in his yearly role as diffinitor, Natalis no doubt influenced the agenda at the successive general chapters between 1309 and 1316 which identified Thomas' teachings as the common and sane teachings of the Order. Certainly, as the chair of the two Dominican commissions, he placed his imprimatur on, if he did not in fact instigate, the terminology of the censures in the two lists: most notably, the characterization of Durandus' censured articles first as, "singulare opinionones," which were outside of and *contra commune*; and then *contra Thomam*. In his own writings, Natalis invokes the phrases *doctrina communis* and *doctor communis*, like mantras, over and over again, further reinforcing the bond between the two concepts in the minds of his readers.

Natalis was not the architect behind the identification of Thomas' teachings with that of his Order: he was building on widespread, if nascent, beliefs already in existence and following a precedent first set by William Hotham. During the conflict between John Pecham and the Oxford Dominicans in the 1280's, supporters on both sides equated Aquinas' teachings with the official doctrines of the Dominican Order.⁹⁴ But, as has been pointed out, however, this was merely the popular perception: "... universal adherence to Thomas was not yet mandatory, even if, after 1277, the public appearance of solidarity in defending the master was increasingly sought."⁹⁵ Much of Natalis' provincialate and generalate were devoted to orchestrating the transformation of this popular belief into fact.

Although Natalis may not have been the first to promote this identification of Aquinas' teachings with those of the Dominican Order, but he was the first and the only one to explicate reasons for it in his arguments. Although references to and justifications for the linking of Aquinas' teachings with those of the Dominican magisterial community are strung throughout his writings, Natalis' treatment of the limits of legitimate theological enquiry in his *Reprobationes excusationes Durandiis* is particularly pertinent to our present discussion.⁹⁶ Although Natalis grants that theologians are not obligated to follow the party line, he finds those who disagree with the communal teachings, as well as the sayings of the great saints, to be presumptuous.⁹⁷ Once again, Natalis' use of the phrase, *doctrina communis*, is meant to conjure up its correlative, *doctor communis*, the title which Aquinas was beginning to acquire within the Dominican community. As Natalis' polemical writings were disseminated throughout the Order, so too was much of his terminology,

spilling over into the works of the young Thomists who followed him into the fray. For instance, John of Sterngassen continually referred to Aquinas as *doctor noster*.⁹⁸

What is incredible about Natalis' argument, however, is not the fact that it was picked up by his subordinates but rather that he made it at all. In 1313, not only were Aquinas' teachings decidedly not those of the majority of Dominican lectors but the first syllabi of errors drawn from Durandus' writings had not been formally censured yet. But in 1313, Natalis was the provincial of France and, as such, exerted tremendous influence over the Dominican *theologi* and *scolares* stationed at St. Jacques. Moreover, analysis of Hervaeus' texts leaves no doubt that, for him, not only should Thomas' teachings be those of the Order but also that these teachings were binding. In fact, judging from his actions, his views must have been crystal clear to even the most obtuse of his contemporaries.

Durandus' stance towards and employment of the medieval concept of the *doctrina communis* provides a stark contrast to that of Natalis and the young Thomists. The younger theologian employed the phrase "*doctor communis beatus Thomas*" on only one occasion and then in a passage in which he had distorted his authority's meaning.⁹⁹ When Durandus appealed to the *doctrina communis*, he was appealing to the consensus of *magistri* throughout the Church—to a consensus drawn more from outside the Order of Preachers than within. But even here, in the vague references to the opinions of the "*doctores*", Durandus does not feel obliged to assent to their teachings. For instance, in the second question of his first Parisian quodlibet, Q. 2, he does not refute Natalis' claim that the "*doctores loquuntur de hiis*," had determined the question in opposition to his own thesis. Rather he simply states that he does not believe the opinion to be true and proceeds to argue against it, drawing upon the works of Aristotle for support.¹⁰⁰ In response, Natalis objected that Durandus did not consider the arguments of the authorities which he cited when determining his conclusions.¹⁰¹

Having seen Natalis' and Durandus' disparate conceptions of *auctoritas*, we can now better understand their respective attitudes towards Thomas, his texts and his teachings. As is to be expected, these attitudes and their foundations differ tremendously. Because Hervaeus Natalis achieved his metaphorical footnote in history by championing Thomas, it would be superfluous to state that he agreed with Aquinas' teachings. What is curious, however, is that there is no instance of Hervaeus knowingly dissenting from the Common Doctor, not even *salve reverentia*. On the general level, although we do not know for sure which of Aquinas' texts Natalis had access to, he does cite both Aquinas' commentary on the *Sentences* and, more often, the *Summa theologiae*. Natalis was better acquainted with Aquinas' work, often providing exact citations for his references.¹⁰²

Further insight into Natalis' convictions regarding Thomas as an *auctoritas* is illustrated by the two very different methodologies which he employed in

his feud with Durandus. First, Natalis' *Defensa doctrina divi Thomae*, as the first wholesale apologia for Thomism, presents Aquinas' legacy as a body of doctrines to be defended.¹⁰³ Structured around Aquinas' *Summa*, the text reads like a commentary or gloss, chock-full of opinions and teachings gleaned from Thomas' texts and dressed with Natalis' own explanation of their meanings. Tacit in his methodology were two beliefs: first, that Aquinas was an *auctoritas* worthy of a commentary; and second, that once explained, Thomas' texts would be accepted. Yet, in most of the short tracts and quodlibets which Natalis employed against Durandus, he rarely cites Thomas. Having a different audience (one which did not recognize Thomas as an *auctoritas*), such efforts would have been sterile. Instead, because he was concerned with proving certain theses to be orthodox and true; and others to be heretical and or false; Natalis relies mostly on reason.

Compared to the case of Natalis, the evidence concerning Durandus' attitude towards Thomas is somewhat sparse. Durandus rarely cited Aquinas by name and never gave exact citations to his texts. This is not to say that he did not cite him at all: scattered throughout Durandus' polemics are occasional references to "*fratre Thomae*" or, more often, "*quidam*."¹⁰⁴ Thus, in most cases, we cannot be sure as to which of Aquinas' texts Durandus had access to or used. Nor is there any certainty that Durandus had not accumulated his knowledge of Thomas' thought second-hand, either from the works of Aquinas' early followers or critics. But what is certain is that Durandus' polemics, as well as his theology, were fundamentally anti-Thomist; that he knew it; his opponents knew it; and after 1313, every other Dominican scattered throughout Europe knew it.

Indeed, there is a great deal of evidence to suggest that Durandus' writings were an intentional assault on Aquinas' teachings. First, there are a few occasions, such as his dissertation on inhered species, in which Durandus cites Aquinas by name and then proceeds to dismiss his position as absurd.¹⁰⁵ Second, the relative absence of explicit citations of Thomas by name within the Durandean corpus is no doubt at least partially due to the context in which they were written. As was mentioned in [chapter 2](#), the General Chapter of 1286 had imposed a prohibition against the public criticism of Aquinas' teachings on the Order. Most of Durandus' writings date from between 1307 and 1315. Up until the Spring of 1314 when he was appointed Master of the Sacred Palace, and to a greater extent in 1317, when he was promoted to the episcopacy, Durandus, had he breached the prohibition, would have left himself open to a number of very real threats ranging from certain removal from office and possible imprisonment to being assigned to missionary work in Albania or exiled to Hereford. Third, beginning with Natalis' first polemic in 1307, Durandus' adversaries repeatedly admonished him that his teachings were *contra Thomam*. It was a charge he neither refuted nor, seemingly, minded.

Yet, as was noted in the previous chapter, as many, if not more, of Durandus'

anti-Thomistic polemics were directed at Hervaeus than were aimed at the teachings of Aquinas. Introducing his *Quol. Paris*, I, q. 2, Durandus explicitly stated that his purpose was to refute the arguments which Natalis had put forward in his *De relatione contra Durandum*.¹⁰⁶ But, prior to being elected Master General in 1318, Natalis was little known outside of the Dominican Order. Had Natalis been the sole object of Durandus' attacks, it is unlikely that the controversies would have generated the furor that they did. More probable is the scenario in which Durandus, haunted by the rising icon of Aquinas, felt compelled to slash away, not only at Aquinas' synthesis, but at his former professor's strict and inflexible interpretations of the Common Doctor before they did, indeed become the common teachings of the Order.

One relevant question which has not been asked is whether or not Durandus (or his confreres) had ever been intent upon setting himself up as an *autoritas*. Throughout most of the controversies, Durandus possessed far more magisterial authority than did his former mentor, at least outside of the small brotherhood of Dominican lectors.¹⁰⁷ At least one extant manuscript dating from the fourteenth century bears a miniature portrait of the younger theologian. Moreover, Durandus cited himself, freely and often. So too, did other scholastics. In a cursory survey of French Dominican manuscripts dating from the years of the controversies, Durandus was cited as an *autoritas* nearly as often as was Albert the Great. Likewise, both the innumerable *reportationes* and copies of Durandus' disputations, as well as those of his critics also attest to his growing *fama*.¹⁰⁸

Whether or not this was the case, there is some indication that the fear of Durandus' rising *autoritas* prompted many of the reactions of both the Dominican hierarchy, in general, and Hervaeus Natalis, in particular. Thus, Natalis gave several arguments calculated to denigrate Durandus' status as an *auctor* and hence, detract from the latter's growing *autoritas*. For instance, Natalis claims that Durandus did not really know or understand the authorities which he cites.¹⁰⁹ Other reactions and countermeasures, noted below and in the third chapter, support the conclusion that, whether or not Durandus aspired to *autoritas*, his Thomistic brethren greatly feared that he might, indeed, become one. As countermeasures the Order reaffirmed its censorship policy; reemphasized the importance of Thomas' *Commentary on the Sentences* in its school curriculum; and reimposed the restrictions of the two syllabi of errors in which Durandus' teachings had been censured.

THE CONTROVERSIES AND AQUINAS' AUCTORITAS

The question of how the controversies affected Aquinas' authority within the Dominican Order deserves to be prefaced with the questions of whether Thomas was, in fact, an authority before their commencement. Not surprisingly, there is a sizeable amount of evidence pointing to an *autoritas* commonly accorded to Aquinas as a *magister*, as well as to the texts which he

had authored. Inside of the Order, Thomas had achieved fame as its defender during the secular-mendicant disputes. Beyond that, however, Thomas' authority was primarily magisterial, resting upon the widespread recognition of his eminent learning, the prodigious number of texts which his efforts yielded and his gift for teaching.

More than one scholar has noted that the extent and nature of the authority granted Aquinas within the Order of Preachers significantly exceeded that which he was accorded within the universal Church.¹¹⁰ Antony Kenny has speculated that, outside of the Dominican Order, Aquinas was regarded as the grand old man' of the generation just passed.¹¹¹ In other words, Thomas was simply a major authority within the context of the *auctoritas* accorded to the *magistri* and was not regarded as being as important as the patristic fathers. Certainly examples of scholastics who, either preceding or following the footsteps of William de la Mare, opposed Thomas' teachings are legion and need not be itemized here.¹¹²

Whether or not Aquinas was an authority during the first twenty-five years after his death, all of the necessary prerequisites for him to become one were in place well before the turn of the century. Considering the trouble taken over his mortal remains, it would have been surprising had his literary remains not received similar care. This was true of the university faculties. On May 2, 1274, the Parisian arts faculty petitioned the Dominican general chapter for not only Thomas' body but also for some philosophical writings which he had begun while at Paris but did not finish until after his departure; some special translations which he had promised them; and some new writings on logic which they, themselves, had asked him to write.¹¹³

Concern for the care, preservation and dissemination of Aquinas' writings are particularly evident among the friars preachers, especially in the Italian provinces.¹¹⁴ During the first years following his death, the principal agents of this endeavor were Thomas' former secretaries at Naples. Peter d'Andria transcribed Thomas' legendarily illegible script so that his texts could be copied. Peter of Bergamo prepared an index to Thomas' known works.¹¹⁵ Reginald of Piperno prepared a catalogue of Aquinas' works, creating the classification which is still used today. These canonical list of texts authored by Aquinas served a number of purposes: they ensured that the titles of Aquinas' works were known; enabled Dominicans (and non-Dominicans) to seek out his texts and to fill in the odd gaps in the libraries and to recognize spurious works, thereby facilitating the diffusion of Thomas' manuscripts.¹¹⁶

Although there is evidence, in the form of early library catalogues or inventories and primitive bibliographies or lists, of the works which Thomas was known to have written, it is impossible to discern exactly how many or how fast Aquinas' writings were disseminated.¹¹⁷ Despite his infamously illegible script, Thomas' secretaries may have transcribed some of most of his works. Yet, most copies of Aquinas' texts were produced, rented or sold by university stationers and booksellers. Extant documents originating within

such shops give us some idea as to which of Thomas' works were available to the university communities. In 1304, for instance, the Sens family, who had a monopoly on Dominican books in Paris, rented at least thirty different titles drawn from Aquinas' literary corpus.¹¹⁸ But we don't know how often they were rented or by whom. The efforts of Aquinas' secretaries would be supplemented by the development of handbooks, manuals and aids designed to facilitate the study of his writings.¹¹⁹

Bridging the gap between the person and his writings, Thomas' nascent authority was supported by his *fama* or personal reputation for having lived a moral and upright life. In fact, there is a great deal of creditable evidence that Thomas was regarded as a saint at the time of his death: the most notable being the bizarre tactics employed by the Cistercians to retain his body.¹²⁰ Immediately following Thomas' death, a popular cult sprung up at Fossanova, and shortly thereafter at San Dominico, which was "quite distinct" from and "had little or nothing" to do with either his teachings or his former magisterial status.¹²¹

In many ways, it is natural to think that the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain had little or nothing to do with either Aquinas' cult or canonization. Yet, the fact that Thomas Aquinas was accorded *auctoritas* of the magisterial variety by some; and that of a saint by others, well before the controversies began, does not negate their impact upon that *auctoritas*. Furthermore, this statement is as applicable to the *auctoritas* which Thomas acquired via the acclamation of a pious populace as to that which he garnered from the infinite citation of his works in scholastic texts. Perhaps, if we had limited our examination to a simplistic cause-effect relationship, that would be true. But the truth was more complicated and much more interesting.

Many different people, events and trends combined to affect Aquinas' canonization.¹²² Perhaps the first thing to note is that there was a surprising amount of exceedingly fierce opposition to Aquinas' canonization. Jean Gerson would later report that at least some of the aversion to Thomas' elevation to beatitude was rooted in the absence of miracles during his own lifetime.¹²³ Yet another group of adversaries to the canonization were the legacy of the Condemnations of 1277. In the eyes of many, Aquinas was simply a heretic. Overlapping with this last group were those scholastics and churchmen who, steeped in the neo-Augustinian tradition, opposed Thomas' teachings. Finally, some of the opposition was, to some extent, political. Despite the peace pacts concluded by John of Vercelli and Jerome of Ascoli, the generals of the Friars Preachers and Minor, in 1274 and 1277, the Franciscans, cognizant that such an event would entail an implicit censure of their own Augustinian and Spiritual currents, made a concerted effort to both blacken Thomas' name and block his canonization up until the very last moment.¹²⁴

Second, few people actively campaigned for the canonization. Of the second estate, only the Sicilian nobility got involved. Even within the Order of Preachers, the advocates were disproportionately small, restricted, for the most

part, to the more zealous of the Thomist *magistri*, such as Natalis; and to members of the newly-created Sicilian province who, motivated by provincial pride, made the canonization their central mission during their early years.

With the exception of Natalis, of all the people to take a part, John XXII was the *sine qua non* of Thomas' canonization.¹²⁵ A long-time fan of Aquinas, John XXII kept a copy of John of Freiburg's *Summa confessorum* (which contained lengthy extractions from Thomas' writings) in his study and Aquinas' *Summa theologiae* next to his bed.¹²⁶ Having incurred an obligation to the Order of Preachers for having hosted his papal coronation, John XXII promised to canonize one of their members. True to himself, if not to his word, the former Jacques Deuse, himself a partisan of the Angevins, rejected the nomination of Raymond of Peñafort when it was brought forward by the King of Aragon. Consequently, although Thomas' supporters had previously endured the proverbial twenty-year papal brush-off, an inquiry into Thomas' sanctity took place at Naples between July 21 and September 18, 1318. A bibliophile to the core, John XXII hedged after the first enquiry, demanded a second; and requested copies of the complete works of Thomas Aquinas for the Vatican library.¹²⁷ Although there is no evidence that they were ever examined by the inquisitors, ample marginal notations in John XXII's own hand testify that the fourteen volumes did not want for use. If Natalis had contributed to the canonization in no other way, his successful tax on the provinces of as many florins as they had priories was no mean achievement.¹²⁸ A second inquiry, limited to the miracles at Aquinas' tomb, took place at Fossanova from November 10 to 20, 1321. John XXII promulgated the bull of canonization in 1323. Two years later, on February 14, 1325, Etienne Bourret, revoked the Parisian condemnations in so far as they affected Thomas' teachings. The Oxford condemnations were never repealed.

An examination of the early hagiography and iconography surrounding Thomas reveals that Aquinas' cult was continually manipulated and shaped by the Dominican hierarchy, often in conjunction with John XXII. Like many works of medieval hagiography, William of Tocco's *vita*, which did not appear until shortly after the promulgation of the canonization bull, was written and extensively re-written not to emphasize the facts of the new saint's life, but to emphasize certain themes and leitmotifs. Interestingly enough, Tocco refashioned the facts of Aquinas' life to meet the political and ecclesiastical realities of his day. More specifically, he emphasized Thomas' disavowal of the Franciscan Spirituals and extensive refutations of the teachings of Joachim of Fiore so as to gain the approval of John XXII.¹²⁹

Dominican iconography also reinterpreted the material of Thomas' life so as to convey concerns particular to their immediate historical and religious context. One of the earliest depictions of Thomas is contained in the "Triumph of Thomas" panel, located in the Dominican convent of Santa Caterina in Pisa and erected in 1320.¹³⁰ After examination, several of the picture's features are somewhat curious. First, Thomas is shown with a halo, three years prior to his

canonization. Intriguingly, the panel's date of origin falls between the two canonization inquiries, suggesting perhaps, that John XXII had actually decided the case after the first and simply postponed the promulgation to silence the opposition. This hypothesis is further supported by the prominent display of John XXII's family crest. Second, the panel has Thomas surrounded by books, with light emanating out of both the future saint and the books. The symbolism is particularly relevant: the Dominicans have traditionally taken refuge in the theme of their Order as the guiding light of the Church during those times when the Order was in trouble.

In a way, Aquinas' cult and canonization are curious phenomena. At first glance, it is indeed curious that the Dominicans made Thomas' teachings the bedrock of his hagiography at precisely the same time that these teachings were under attack by such notables as Dietrich of Friburg, James of Metz and Durandus of St. Pourçain. But, viewed from a distance, it suited the times. John XXII used the canonization as a rebuff to those who had rocked his papacy with their upheavals: namely, the Averroists, the Nominalists and, most especially, the Franciscan Spirituals.¹³¹ Depending upon one's viewpoint, the Order of Preachers used Aquinas' sainthood to either restore its traditional leitmotif of unity or to impose a homogeneity on the theology of its members.

Concurrent to the Dominicans' reformation of Thomas' cult and the consummation of his canonization, his texts and the *auctoritas* which was accorded them, continued to be absorbed into the Dominican ethos. Particularly relevant to the Order's mission, the *cura animarum*, was the assimilation of Thomas' teachings into Dominican confessional handbooks and preaching manuals.¹³² As a result, Aquinas steadily acquired authority within the context of the Dominicans' practical ministry. By extension, he also gained authority in the area of moral theology, and was thus cited in the sermons of Remigio di Girolami, Aldobrandino de Tuscanella and Nicoluccio de Ascolis.¹³³ But, it should be noted, this *auctoritas* as largely restricted to the *Secunda secundae*.

Having examined Aquinas' cult and his authority within the Order's pastoral activities, it is possible to see the relationship between the controversies and Aquinas' intra-Dominican *auctoritas* in a new light. First, however holy Aquinas might have been, the push behind his canonization came from those who wished to promote his teachings. Moreover, as was discussed above, his cult was refashioned to reinforce a popular perception of Thomas as an orthodox theologian and to further promote an acceptance of his teachings. In other words, the controversies between Natalis and Durandus were one of the contributing factors to Aquinas' canonization.

Second, it is apparent that Aquinas' *auctoritas* within the Dominican Order prior to the conflict between Natalis and Durandus differed in scope and nature from that which emerged after Natalis' death. Although Thomas' writings were preserved and disseminated throughout the Order by his earlier disciples, the actual adherence of the *fratres communes* to his teachings was

restricted largely to the area of moral theology. Interest in and adherence to the vast majority of his teachings was limited to a small number of Dominican *magistri* and bachelors drawn from among the Order's intellectual elites within the *studia generalia*. The majority of Dominican lectors, stationed far and away from the intellectual capitals of Paris and Oxford; and engaged in teaching in the conventual and provincial schools, held views much the same as did most non-Dominican scholastics.

The controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain transformed and extended Aquinas' *auctoritas* within the Dominican Order in a number of concrete and measurable ways. First, they brought those of Aquinas' teachings, particularly those drawn from his metaphysics, psychology and cosmology, which had previously been relatively neglected, to the attention to the Dominican intelligentsia. In doing so, the debates between Natalis and Durandus not only illuminated many of the issues which underpinned the clash between the Augustinian and Thomist traditions but, by its public and comprehensive examination of Aquinas' thought also established a bridge between the practical theology entailed in the Order's *cura animarum* and the speculative theology which flourished in its schools. As a result, an increasing number of Thomas' teachings were absorbed into the texts and thought of a steadily expanding pool of Dominican scholastics.

Contiguous to this spread of Thomism as a result of the controversies' polemics, both Thomas' teachings and the defense of those teachings continued to spread throughout the Order as a result of Natalis' policies as provincial and as Master General. If Durandus had rejected his mentor's ideology, the same could not be said of Natalis' other proteges. During his tenure as provincial of France (1309–1318), Natalis had influenced the choice of John of Naples (1309), Peter of Palude (1310) and James of Lausanne (1314) as bachelors of theology at Paris. He was to continue this policy of affixing an ideological litmus text to promotion in studies or to inception, during his generalate. From their lectures, disputations, writings and sermons, these young theologians saturated the Dominican *schola* with Thomas ideas and opinions, rendering them, over time, almost commonplace. The growing acceptance of Aquinas' *auctoritas* was further propelled and reflected in Thomas' succession of honorific titles, which ranged from the *doctor eximiis* spawned by Richard Knapwell in 1282 to that of *doctor communis*, to which we have already been introduced.

Second, the conflict was the catalyst behind the imposition of Thomas' texts in the Dominican schools. For instance, the General Chapter of 1313 not only prohibited the recitation or confirmation of opinions which contradicted those of Aquinas but mandated a three-year course in his teachings for students bound for Paris.¹³⁴ Although the Lombard's *Sentences* continued to serve as the Dominicans' basic textbook, it was increasingly supplemented by Thomas' own *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum* and *Summa theologiae*. But just as the controversies resulted in the promotion of Thomas' teachings within the Dominican Order, so too did they lead to repeated attempts by the Dominican

hierarchy to eradicate the more pervasive and radical Augustinian elements from their midst. Despite all the countermeasures, the Order was still faced with the problem of students and lectors using unauthorized *reportationes* of the first redaction of Durandus' *In Petri Lombardi sententias theologicas commentariorum libri III*.¹³⁵ Whether in acquiescence to his superiors or simply to avoid more problems, Durandus began to mark the "approved" versions of the second and third redactions of his commentary.¹³⁶ As a result of the widespread diffusion of Durandus' teachings, Dominican lectors established a number of procedures to offset their influence, including noting the 1314 corrections and citing the location of the "right doctrine" in Thomas' *Summa* or *Commentary to the Sentences* in the margins of Durandus' texts.¹³⁷

The controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain transformed Thomas' teachings into *doctrina consensus* and thereby sealed his *auctoritas* within the Order of Preachers. Although other Dominican theologians had failed to adhere to (and had even refuted) Thomas' doctrinal teachings, Durandus had done them one better by doing so through repeated assaults on the staunchest of Aquinas' defenders. If the doctrinal contrasts between Natalis and Durandus may have been exacerbated by varying degrees of resentment, envy and even personal enmity; they were also magnified by concurrent events and processes taking place on the larger stage of the universal Church: namely, the upheavals generated by the Spirituals, the continuation of the near-fratricidal rivalry between the two mendicant orders, and the oppressive atmosphere which followed the Council of Vienne in 1311. The doctrinal storms generated by the controversies between Natalis and Durandus took place in a milieu in which Dominican concerns for orthodoxy and doctrinal homogeneity were far more pronounced.

Even after Thomas' canonization in 1323, the Dominican hierarchy continued its efforts to form and mold the new saint's cult so as to magnify the intellectual orientation of the new saint and to disseminate his teachings. These efforts were not confined to the maneuvering and intrigue characteristic of high level ecclesiastical politics but were manifested in very concrete ways at the parochial level. For instance, in the 1350's, Friar Jacob of Peter, the prior of the Pisan convent, removed and sold the waxen images which had been hung in commemoration of Thomas' healing powers during the Black Death of 1348.¹³⁸

Yet, the extent to which the *fratres communes* actually knew, understood and were able and willing to defend Aquinas' teachings is somewhat more debatable. Friar Bartolommeo da San Concordio, who lived out most of his professed life at the Dominican house in Pisa and died in 1347, is recorded as having not only memorized much of Aquinas' work but of defending his teachings against his critics.¹³⁹ But the chronicle in which his accomplishments are recorded also noted that these attainments had rendered him unique among the Pisan friars. Instead, the evidence suggests that Aquinas' teachings and *auctoritas* were best accepted by those who were at the

major Dominican educational centers, whatever the geographic region or spiritual or intellectual tradition. Thus, Henry of Suso was always careful to accord a particular authority to Thomas: “Doctor egregius inter ceteros et super ceteros, sicut rosa sine spina.”¹⁴⁰

Even at the time of the controversies, the *auctoritas* which was increasingly being bestowed upon Thomas by the Friar Preachers spilt over into the Augustinian and Carmelite Orders (but not, needless to say, into that of their sibling rivals, the Franciscans). In the writings of James of Viterbo, Thomas’ writings are referred to as, “*communis veritas, communis claritas, communis illuminatio, communis ordo et doctrina*.”¹⁴¹ Throughout the fourteenth century Thomas was referred to as the *doctor communis* in Augustinian commentaries and texts. In practice, this meant that Thomas was given a primacy second only to that of Giles of Rome, which, within the Augustinian ethos, simply meant that he “was listened to” first but often contradicted “*salva reverential*.”¹⁴² Similarly the roster of prestigious medieval Carmelite Thomists, beginning with Guido Terreni and continuing throughout the century, indicate the Order’s acquiescence to Aquinas’ *auctoritas*.

Aquinas’ *auctoritas* within the Dominican Order served as a font from which his *auctoritas* was gradually disseminated throughout the Church via the writings of Dominican theologians. In the late fourteenth century, the question of whether or not Thomas Aquinas was an *auctoritas*, of any rank, within the universal Church was settled by the Immaculate Conception controversy when John Montson, a Dominican at St. Jacques, argued against the doctrine, appealing to Aquinas as his principal authority.¹⁴³ A century and a half later, Aquinas’ *auctoritas* was catapulted above and beyond that of Augustine by the doctrinal controversies of the Counter-Reformation. Many persons, trends and events contributed to this process. But each of these had been affected; directly or, more often, indirectly; by either one or both of our antagonists, or the conflict between them. In the fourteenth century, Dionysius de Burgo characterized Thomas’ as being primarily “anti-Durandus.”¹⁴⁴ At the turn of the century, Silvestro da Prierio would resurrect Natalis’ arguments on predicamental relations against his former pupil to use against Cajetan.¹⁴⁵ In the fifteenth, Capreolus devoted forests of pages to the refutation of Durandus. None of these events would have been possible had not Aquinas already been well established as an *auctoritas* within the Order of Preachers.

Having examined the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain within the concrete, institutional context of the Dominican Order; as well as that of the clash between the Thomists and conservative Augustinian thinkers which dominated the higher *studia* of the fourteenth century—both inside and outside of the Order—it is apparent that these disputes, in dissimilar ways and to various degrees, influenced each of the three fundamental trends which, together, resulted in Aquinas’ acquisition of *auctoritas* in the early fourteenth century.

The least obvious of these is the manner in which the controversies affected

Aquinas' cult and canonization. But had not the Order of Preachers intervened, Thomas would have been perceived by the medieval populace as were so many other saints—namely, as a source of miracles and healing. Instead, seeking to meet its own needs, the Dominican hierarchy discouraged this popular devotion and replaced it with a cult which was inextricably bound up with Thomas' teachings. In doing so, they were, in part, motivated by a need to react to the overly fideistic theology of the more extreme Augustinian thinkers and reaffirm the more rationalistic leitmotifs within their own tradition. It was a need which Aquinas met admirably—but one which other holy and deceased Dominican *magistri*, such as Albertus Magnus, could have met as well. The end result was, at least in part, due to the disparate activities of Dominican thinkers in the Thomist and Albertine traditions in the early fourteenth century. It would be simplistic to say that Aquinas achieved the stature he did because his followers, led by Natalis, were refuting the ideology of Augustinian proponents (many of whom happened to be perceived by the Dominicans as their enemies) while Albert's intellectual heirs were visiting beguinages and writing manuals on mysticism. But it is not unreasonable to speculate that the actions and reputations of the adherents of the two traditions contributed to the reception of their respective schools.

Similarly, the history of Aquinas' canonization is also inextricably bound up with that of the early Thomist school. Had not John XXII been as vexed by the Franciscan Spirituals, along with the adherents of other offshoots from the Joachite tree, then he might well have decided to postpone the Angelic Doctor's canonization yet again. On a more fundamental level, however, Aquinas' canonization came about because a couple of groups pushed long and hard for its realization, compiled the petitions, sponsored Thomas' vitae and paid the curial fees. Of the groups who did so, the most active, even proactive were the early Thomists, again led by Natalis. One of the primary reasons that they did so was to hinder the growing popularity of Durandus' teachings among the Dominican lectors in the lower *studia*.

The manner in which the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain influenced Aquinas' *autoritas* within Dominican moral theology, or more precisely, in the Dominican pastorate, is also indirect. Yet, the *fratres communes* learned their moral theology at the hands of lectors formed in the higher *studia* and studied manuals which disseminated the teachings and commonly-held opinions of Dominican *magistri* from the *studia generalia*. As a result, the teachings and practices which predominated in the Dominican pastorate were directly tied to the philosophical and theological opinions widely accepted in the Dominican *studia generalia*. In other words, had Durandus' teachings on relation and cognition succeeded in winning the hearts and minds of the Dominican *magistri*, the friar preachers out in the fields of the Lord would have been preaching vastly different theses on free will, the nature of sin and the sacraments.

But the most obvious and direct manner in which the conflict between

Natalis and Durandus facilitated Aquinas' *auctoritas* within the Dominican Order was through their polemics and the ripples which those polemics sent through the Dominican *studia*. The impact of the controversies on Aquinas' *auctoritas* played out on a number of levels. First, the initial polemics by both men persuaded their confreres, even inspiring some to join into the fray. Second the debates between Natalis and Durandus led directly to the convocation of the two intra-Dominican commissions of inquiry into Durandus' writings in 1313 and 1317—each in and of itself an extremely rare occurrence in Dominican history. Although members of both committees disagreed among themselves as to the nature, identity and degree of Durandus' errors, they all had problems with his writings, as they understood them. Examined closely, the controversies and the commissions were part and parcel of the same process. For example, the polemics exchanged by the two antagonists on relation served as a catalyst for the convocation of the inquiry; influenced, if not decided, the committee's declaration of Durandus' teachings on relation as heretical. During the interim between the two inquiries, Natalis' and Durandus' polemics made it exceedingly clear to the members of the 1317 committee that, while the application of Durandus' teaching on relation to the Trinity led to heresy, the employment of Aquinas' teachings did not. In the end, the conflict between Natalis and Durandus led directly to the capitular legislation which imposed selected teachings and texts from the Thomistic corpus onto the Dominican *schola*. This legislation, in turn, was the *sine qua non* for Aquinas' *auctoritas* within the Order of Preachers during the late Middle Ages.

In conclusion, the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain did not create Aquinas' *auctoritas*: that had been fermenting since his own lifetime. Nor did they lead directly to the Thomist flood which would sweep through the Church in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries: other people and events during the interim would bring about that backlash. But the extended polemical wars between the two men did interact with the ecclesiastical context in which they lived, as well as the long-term intellectual and religious currents which were coursing through that context, and determined the manner in and extent to which Aquinas' *auctoritas* within the Order would manifest itself.

Conclusion

THIS DISSERTATION HAS EXPLORED WHY THE ORDER OF PREACHERS adopted Thomism when and in the manner that they did. Ostensibly, these questions address issues which concerned scholars thirty and seventy years ago, respectively; namely the differences between religious orders and the nature of primitive Thomism. Yet, the methodology employed in this work has devolved from more recent scholarship, in focusing on how the Friar Preachers conceptualized themselves, as well as the factors which influenced their successive decisions regarding Thomas, his texts, his teachings, and, ultimately, his *auctoritas*. Thus, although these decisions, as well as the events, people and processes which motivated them, have traditionally been addressed from either the vantage point of institutional or intellectual history, for the medieval Dominicans involved, they were of a whole; and it is thus that I have attempted to treat them here. The results are both surprising and exceedingly complex.

The traditional perception has been that the Dominican leadership imposed Thomism upon the Order and thereby transformed the Dominican school into the nucleus of the Thomist. But this interpretation fails to take into account the representative nature of Dominican government; the constitutional mandate that every *acta* must be passed by three successive general chapters to be ratified; the rapid turnover of religious officials who, for the most part, served only brief terms; and the Friar Preachers' peculiarly Dominican understanding of the nature of religious obedience. The nature of Dominican government structures, therefore, negates the possibility that the Dominican leadership could have imposed Thomism upon the Order from above unless they possessed the support of (at least) a significant and vocal minority of the diffinitors and religious superiors who served in the general chapters.

Institutionally, the process by which Thomism was channeled in the Dominican schools happened in increments, one stage at a time, each of which was initiated by a single piece of capitular *acta* which in turn was unevenly enforced and imperfectly implemented. Moreover, each of these *acta*, in turn, was promulgated as a group reaction to a set of events, considered and acted

upon by the Friar Preachers within a specific set of circumstances, both internal and external to the Order. Of these circumstances, the easiest to discern and explain are the ways in which the actions and attitudes of other medieval institutions, such as the Franciscans and the papacy, affected those of the Dominicans.

During the first three-quarters of the thirteenth century, the Orders of Friars Preachers and Minors were united, with the exception of some local friction, by shared interests and concerns. But during the interim between the death of Aquinas in 1274 and that of Ockham in 1348, the opposite progressively became the case. Exacerbated by the attacks of William de la Mare and others, the friction which had always been inherent in the relationship between the two Orders flared into open hostility. In this context, the actions of some members of the Friars Minor controverted many Dominican longings for their Augustinian origins. In addition, as the Franciscans became increasingly preoccupied with the crises occasioned by Spirituals and the heterodoxy of some of its more radical and vocal theologians brought their Order under the suspicion of the ecclesiastical establishment, it well-behooved the Dominicans to escape from being tarred with the same brush.

More complex, perhaps were the effects of the Dominicans' relationship with the papacy on their theology. Although this relationship was not a focal point within this analysis, even the few instances in which the popes appear in our examination of early Dominican Thomism is easily translated into a paradigm which is simply this: the Dominicans enjoyed the privileges and benefits of an amicable relationship with those pontiffs who looked favorably upon Thomas and his teachings and, reciprocally, suffered under those who did not. This is not to say that ecclesiastical politics dictated the Dominicans' theological preferences; but rather that they enhanced and illuminated certain preferences and beliefs already present within the Dominican intellectual tradition.

More decisive were the theological trends and doctrinal currents intrinsic to the Order of Preachers, itself. The circumstances of the Dominicans' origins and their style of preaching necessitated a rigorous theological training on the part of their members which, in turn, had a number of consequences. First, constituted by its ecclesiastical mandate to preach, the Order of Preachers was, from its origins, concerned with what its members preached precisely because they preached on matters doctrinal. As its field of activity expanded to include the universities, the Order would extend its concern to the theses disputed by its theologians. Second, although most Dominican lectors prior to the 1310s were within the Augustinian tradition, they understood and viewed that intellectual tradition differently than did non-Dominicans. Formed to think critically, to re-examine theses put forward by their opponents, they were thus more open to persuasion by reason. Third, by the time of the controversies, the friar preachers had a century-long tradition of appropriating whatever was useful—first from scholasticism, and then from the Aristotelian

corpus. By enlarging the theological enterprise with Aristotelian elements, Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas provided their brethren (and others) with a greater range of tools and concepts with which to reason about not only doctrine but faith and morals as well.

It was with these currents bubbling beneath the surface that the Dominican lectors were confronted with the controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain. Upon their advent, the Dominican educational system had already been well established as a vast network in which new texts and ideas could be rapidly disseminated and, as we have seen, this is what happened with the polemics of Natalis and Durandus—particularly those of the latter. But who were these texts and ideas aimed at and who read them? In another work, Leonard Boyle has established that many “popular” Dominican works, such as Vincent de Beauvais’ *Speculum maius*, were aimed specifically at the *fratres communes*, who comprised the majority of the Order’s members.¹ In contrast, the polemics of Natalis and Durandus were aimed at the other audience within the Order; namely those elite friars who had advanced at least as far as the specialized provincial *studia* and thus had been exposed to what we would consider higher education. For the most part, this elite minority did not engage directly in the Order’s ministry of the *cura animarum*: they formed, educated and supervised those who did. More importantly, it was the only constituency in the Order either sophisticated enough to follow the threads of argument from Durandus’ teaching on relations to all of their logical conclusions, or capable of fathoming what the concept *theologia* as a scientific enterprise would entail for them as theologians.

But why did this group of highly trained Dominican elites react to Hervaeus Natalis, Durandus of St. Pourçain and the controversies between them the way that it did? Prior to the controversies, the only act that the general chapters had taken in regard to Thomas was in reaction to the English Dominicans who, following Kilwardy, had “caused scandal” by denigrating Thomas and his teachings. It is here that we get the first glimmer of one of the elements which contributed to the Dominican lectors’ reaction to the controversy.

At first glance, the relationship between Hervaeus Natalis and his fellow Dominican *magistri* seems to be pretty obvious: he used his various positions and offices to campaign for the widespread acceptance of Thomas’ teachings and his scholastic talents, such as they were, to attack those who failed to fall in line. But this is to make a caricature of a complicated man and to overlook too many dimensions of his life as a Dominican. Thus, while it is true that he spent much of his academic life defending Aquinas in various polemical battles; he was also one of Meister Eckhart’s early patrons, and if he made a concerted effort to ensure that the Dominicans’ magisterial chairs were held by Thomists at Paris; the same could not be said of his stewardship of the Dominican *studia, generalia* at Oxford, Montpellier or Cologne. Moreover, the duties of religious office absorbed a far greater proportion of Natalis’ professed

life than did his scholastic activities and these, in turn, were focused primarily upon educational reform, attempts to bring the friars back to some minimalist standards of observance and protecting the Order from scandals which would bring it to the attention of the ever-benevolent John XXII. Except for his controversies with Durandus, it was as first provincial and later Master General that Natalis was known by his contemporaries and remembered by their immediate successors.

Natalis' ecclesiastical positions within the Order may or may not have influenced the manner in which the Dominican intelligentsia received his polemics against Durandus. But they did provide an interesting parallel to some of his arguments. The brunt of Natalis' arguments against Durandus was quite simply that he was wrong: hence the constant references to Thomas' teachings as "sanior" and "communior." But interwoven with this leitmotif were others, the most intriguing of which was the equation of Thomas' teachings with those commonly held by the Dominican magisterial community. In other words, Natalis repeatedly appealed to the corporate pride of his readers.

In contrast, Durandus defied the commonly held opinions of the Dominican magisterial community, not by rejecting Thomas' teachings but in the manner that he did so—and, seemingly did not care that he did. Curiously, not once did Durandus point out the teachings of Aquinas were not those of the majority of Dominicans. Nor is there any evidence that he ever took the identity of his audience into consideration when formulating and explicating his arguments.

As a result, in his critiques of Thomas, he failed a number of communal philosophical and theological "tests" in the eyes of his confreres. First, Durandus' innovative theories regarding relations got him into trouble on two fronts: they presented a Trinitarian theology which raised the specter of heterodoxy; and, being exceedingly intricate and easily misunderstood, led the young bachelors studying him to do likewise. In the area of cognition, his rejection of the theme of the intellectual agent implied an adhesion to the Augustinian theory of illumination.² Indeed, a myriad of neo-Augustinian themes seem to resonate throughout Durandus' writings, ranging from the whole of his cognitive theory to his rejection of the scientific status of theology, thereby planting the seeds of suspicion in the minds of his confreres that he possessed intellectual and spiritual affinities to traditions which were not their own. These suspicions could not have been but exacerbated by Durandus' continual appeals to the papacy; his fond appropriation of Joachim of Fiore as a cause celebre and his complete disregard for the authority of Dominican religious officials, general chapters and the commissions which they jointly appointed.

But neither the personalities of the antagonists nor the corporate pride of their audience were the deciding factors in either Aquinas' acquisition of theological authority within the Order of Preachers or in the Dominicans' adoption of Thomas' teachings. Earlier this century, the neo-scholastics

complained long and often that the writings of Aquinas' early followers, such as Natalis, did not quite match up with anything that they, themselves, would regard as Thomism; and that moreover a "genuine" Thomism did not really flourish within the medieval Dominican Order. But the thing of it is, when one looks at how the Dominicans reacted to the controversies and how they adopted and assimilated bits and pieces of Thomas' thought, that was never really their intent in the first place.

The philosophical and theological problems which confronted the Dominicans in the early fourteenth century were shared neither by their predecessors in the mid-thirteenth or their successors in the early twentieth centuries. Neither were the options available to them by which to solve those problems. When confronted with the seemingly heterodox threat of Durandus' 'singular opinions', with all the scandal and ideological schism that purported, in conjunction with his soaring popularity among the lectors in the lower schola, the most readily available intellectual remedy was already contained in the polemics of Natalis and his fellow Thomists. Those arguments put forward by the early Thomists which were not useful to the Order, such as the unicity of forms, were bypassed in silence. Those which were useful and which did meet the Order's intellectual and psychological needs were appropriated, disseminated and used on a widespread basis.

Although the motives and aspirations of individual Dominicans may have differed from friar to friar, the Dominican elites who passed and implemented the legislation were not, as a group, trying to appropriate or establish a comprehensive' form of Thomism. They didn't adopt the whole of the Thomistic corpus. Instead, they picked and chose among Aquinas' works; and then sought to control which of Thomas' texts were studied by their students as they passed through the various Dominican schools. Moreover, they sought to control how they were studied and with which teaching aids. Their primary goal was not to turn the Dominican school into the nucleus of the Thomistic, it was to take possession of those scholastic tools and concepts which would enable their Order to find the truths necessary to understand and teach orthodox doctrine; and to carry out the *cura animarum* for which it was founded.

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

1. Pierre Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant et l'averroïsme latin au XIII^{me} siècle, étude critique et documents inédits*, Collectanea friburgensia, 8 (Fribourg (Suisse): Librairie de l'Université, 1899): xlvii–xlix.

2. William Hinnebusch, *History of the Dominican Order*, 2 vols. (New York: Alba House, 1966) and Raymond Spiazzi, *Alla Scuola di San Domenico*, 5 vols. (Rome: San Sisto Vecchio, 1967–1985). An updated synopsis of Hinnebusch's work can be found in his *Brève histoire de l'Ordre dominicain* (Paris: Cerf, 1990). For a shorter, more popular work, see Benedict Ashley, *The Dominicans* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990).

3. For Durandus' treatment of sacramental theology, see Ramón Arnau, "La aportación de Durando de S. Porciano OP a la teología del sacramento del orden," *Escritos Vedat* 8 (1978): 95–121 and Ludwig Ott, "Die Auseinandersetzung des Durandus de S. Porcianom Thomas vom Aquin in der Lehre vom Weihesakrament," in *Thomas vom Aquino. Interpretation und Rezeption: Studien und Texte*, ed. W. Eckert, Walbergen Studien, Philosophische Reihe, 5 (Mainz: Matthias Grunewald Verlag: 1974): 519–558 and idem., *Die Lehre des Durandus de S. Porciano O.P. vom Weihesakrament: dargestellt nach den verschiedenen Redaktionen seines Sentenzenkommentars und nach der Diskussion der Dominikanertheologie des beginnenden 14. Jahrhunderts*, Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Institutes zur Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Theologie und Philosophie, Neu Folge 17 (München: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1972). For Natalis' sacramental theology, see Kenneth Plotnik, *Hervaeus Natalis OP and the controversies over the real presence and transubstantiation*, Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Institutes zur Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Theologie und Philosophie, Neu Folge 10 (München: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1970).

4. For Natalis' position on free will versus determinism, see Werner Schöllgen, *Das problem der Willensfreiheit bei Heinrich von Gent und Hervaeus Natalis: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kampfes zwischen Augustinismus und Aristotelismus in der Hochscholastik*, Abhandlungen aus Ethik und Moral, 6 (Düsseldorf: Druck und Verlag von L. Schwann, 1927). For Durandus', see Prospero T. Stella, "Le <<Quaestiones de Libero Arbitrio>> "di Durando da S. Porciano," *Salesianum* 3 (1962): 450–524.

5. A history of the twentieth-century debate and correlative historiography is provided in Cyril Vollert, *The doctrine of Hervaeus Natalis on primitive justice and original sin as developed in the controversy on original sin during the early decades of the fourteenth century*, Analecta Gregoriana, 42 (Rome: Universitas Gregoriana, 1947): 11–44.

6. Joseph Koch, *Durandus de S. Porciano, O.P.: Forschungen zum Streit um Thomas von Aquin zu Beginn des 14. Jahrhunderts*, Beiträge Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, 26 (1927): "Die Jahre 1312–1317 im Leben des Durandus de sancto Porciano O. Pr.," in *Per la storia della Teologia e della Filosofia*, Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle I, Studi e testi 37 (Roma: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana: 124): 265–306; "Die Magister-Jahre des Durandus de S. Porciano, O.P. und der Konflikt mit seinem Orden," and "Ein neuer Zeuge für die gegen Durandus de S. Porciano gerichtete thomistische Irrtumsliste," in *Kleine Schriften*, 2 (Roma: Edizioni di storia et letteratura, 1973): 7–118 and 119–126; and "Die Verteidigung der theologie des Hl. Thomas von Aquin durch den Dominikanerorden gegenüber Durandus de S. Porciano, O.Pr.," *Xenia Thomistica* 3 (Rome, 1925): 327–362.

7. In those instances where Koch's time line has been amended by the more recent archival excavations of Bruno Decker, we have followed the latter. See Bruno Decker, *Die Gotteslehre des Jakob*

von Metz: *Untersuchungen zur Dominikanertheologie zu Beginn des 15. Jahrhunderts*, BGPTMA 42/1 (1967): 73–77 and 80–87. Hereafter cited as Decker, *Jakob von Metz*. In addition, the dates of some of the works by Natalis' used to supplement our knowledge of his overall thought have been borrowed from Frederick J. Roensch, *Early Thomistic school* (Dubuque, Iowa: The Priory Press, 1964): 106–117.

8. Koch discusses the genesis and evolution of his dissertation, and the works which eventually grew out of it in "Durandus de S. Porciano, O.P.," 1–4. Koch began his study of Durandus in 1922 under the direction of Franz Pelster. As his research matured, he sought guidance from and freely cited Ehrle, Birkenmajer, Beltràn de Heredia, Mandonnet, Théry and Xiberta.

9. Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Thomas and the Italian thought of the Renaissance," in *Medieval aspects of Renaissance learning: three essays*, ed. Edward P. Mahoney, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994): 29–95; esp. 31.

10. Most of these have been collected, edited and published in the *Monumenta Ordinis fratrum praedicatorum historica* series. Readers should beware, however: titles, imprints, places of publication and publishers all vary from volume to volume and from edition to edition.

11. *Constitutiones antiquae ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum* in A.H. Thomas, *De oudst Constituties van de Dominicanen: Voorgeschiedenis, Tekst, Bronnen, Ontstaan en Ontwikkeling (1215–1237)*, published as fascimile 42 of *Bibliothèque de la Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (Louvain, 1965). Hereafter cited as *Constitutiones antiquae*, Thomas. Other editions include Heribert Scheeben, *Die Konstitutionen des Predigerordens unter Jordan von Sachsen, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Dominikanerordens in Deutschland*, 38 (Koln: Albertus-Magnus Verlag, in Kommission bei Otto Harrassowitz, 1939): 48–80; Georgina R. Galbraith, *The Constitution of the Dominican Order, 1214–1360* (Manchester: At the University Press, 1925); and Henry Denifle, "Constitutiones antiquae ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum," *ALKGM* 1 (1885): 165–222. An English translation of selections drawn from *Constitutiones* can be found in the appendices of Simon Tugwell's *Early Dominicans: selected writings* (New York: Paulist Press, 1982): 453–570.

12. *Acta capitulorum generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum ab anno 1220 usque ad annum...*, 1 & 2, ed. B. Reichert, *Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum historica*, t. 3–4 (Romae: Ex typographia Polyglotta S.C. de Propaganda Fide, 1898–1904). Vol. 1: 1220–1323; vol. 2, 1304–1378. Hereafter cited as *Acta*. Future citations are made according to the following format: *Acta*, vol. number, year of promulgation, page number. An index to the *acta* is available under a different title. See *Acta capitulorum generalium: index alphabeticus*, 2 vols., ed. B. Reichert (Romae: [s.n., 1952]), *MOPH* 1–2. The provincial capitular *acta* are much more dispersed. See *Acta capitulorum provincialium ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum, Première province de Provence, Province romaine, Province d'Espagne (1239–1302)*, ed. Célestin Douais (Toulouse: É. Privat, 1894) and *Acta capitulorum provincialium provinciae Romanae (1243–1344)*, ed. Thomae Kaeppli, Antoine Dondaine and Innocenzo Taurisano, *MOPH* 20 (Romae: Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1941). Hereafter cited as *Acta prov. Prov.* and *Acta prov. Rom.*, respectively. Citations of the provincial *acta* follow the pattern itemized above.

13. See, for example, Jordan of Saxony, *Beati Iordani de Saxonia Epistulae*, ed. Angelus Walz, *MOPH* 23 (Romae: Apud Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1951) and Humbert de Romans, *Opera De vita regulari*, 2 vols., ed. J.J. Berthier (Turin: Marietti, 1956).

14. Especially, *Litterae encyclicae magistrorum generalium ordinis praedicatorum ab anno 1233 usque ad annum 1376*, ed. Benedict Reichert and Andreas Früwirth, *MOPH* 5 (Roma: ex Typographia Polyglotta S.C. de Propaganda Fide, 1900). See also the much more recent, Jordan of Saxony, *Litterae encyclicae: annis 1233 et 1234 datae*, Biblioteca del Centro per il collegamento degli studi medievali e umanistici in Umbria; 10 (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto medioevo, 1993).

15. Of these, the most pertinent are Gerald di Frachet's *Chronica ordinis* which covers the years between 1203 and 1496 and is contained in *Chronica et chonicorum excerpta historiam Ordinis Praedicatorum illustrantia*, ed. B. Reichert, *MOPH*, 7/1 (Romae: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S.C. de Propaganda Fide, 1904); the *Monumenta diplomatica S. Dominic*, compiled by Vladimir J. Koudelka, *MOPH* 25 (Romae: Apud Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1966) [hereafter cited as *Monumenta*, Koudelka]; the *Monumenta historica sancti patris nostri Dominici*, 2 vols., *MOPH* 15–16 (Romae ad S. Sabinae: Institutum Historicum FF. Praedicatorum, 1933–?) [hereafter cited as *Monumenta historica*] and Laurent Pignon, *Laurentii Pignon catalogi et chronica; accedunt catalogi stamsensis et upsalensis scriptorum O.P.*, ed G. Meerseman, *MOPH*, 18 (Romae apud S. Sabinae: apud Institutum historicum fratrum praedicatorum, 1936).

16. *Bullarium ordinis fratrum praedicatorum*, ed. Thomas Ripoll and Antonio Bremond (Rome: Hieronymi Mainardi, 1729). Hereafter cited as *BOP*.

17. This is especially true in the case of the Order of Friars Minor and the University of Paris. For the latter, see *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, 2 vols., ed. Henricus Denifle and Aemilio Chatelain

(Paris: Ex Typis Pratum Delalin, 1889–1897). Hereafter cited as *CUP*.

18. Roensch, *Early Thomistic school*, 110–117.

19. This is not to argue that the censorship was entirely successful but merely that it contributed to the overall attrition of Durandus' works. Indeed, see Ambrosio de Altamura, *Bibliothecae Dominicanae: accuratis collectionibus, primo ab Ordinis constitutione usque ad annum 1600 productae hoc seculari appartu*, (Romae: Nicolai Angeli Tinassij, 1677): 109–110; which lists several works by Durandus as being held by conventual libraries in the early modern period of which we have no other evidence.

20. *Catalogus Stamsensis scriptorum ordinis Praedicatorum* and *Catalogus Upsalensis scriptorum ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. G. Meersseman, *MOPH*, XVIII (Romae: 1936); Quétif-Echard, *Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1959): 1, 533–536 [hereafter cited as *SOP*]; Daniel Mortier, *Histoires des Maitres Généraux de l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs*, 2 (Paris: Picard, 1903–1920); 3, 389. See also Palémon Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIII^e siècle*, vol. 17 (Paris: 1933–4): 199–206 for Natalis and 213–220 for Durandus. Additions by V. Doucet in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 27 (1935): 531–64.

21. Jean Pierre Müller, "Quästionen der ersten Redaction von I, un II. Sent. des Durandus de Sancto Porciano in einer Hs. Der Biblioteca Antoniana in Padua," *Divus Thomas* 19 (1941): 435–446.

22. Two versions of this work are Hervaeus Natalis, "Die gegen Durandus gerichtete Streitschrift des Hervaeus Natalis <<De articulis pertinentibus ad primum Sententiarum Durandi>> (Art. 1–5)," ed. Takeshiro Takada in *Sapientiae procerum amore: Mélanges Médiévistes offerts à Dom Jean-Pierre Müller O.S.B. à l'occasion de son 70^{ème} anniversaire (24 février 1974)*, ed. Theodor W. Köhler, *Studia Anselmiana* 63 (Rome: Editrice Anselmiana, 1974): 439–456 and idem., "Quinque responsa ad totidem articulos ex Durandi de S. Porciano commentario in Sententias excerptos," *Vat. Lat.* 817 (f.93r–97r). Extracts of Natalis' *Reprobationes excusationum Durandi* have been edited and published in Raymond Martin, *La controverse sur le péché originel au début du XIV^e siècle: textes inédits*, *Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense* 10 (Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1930): 373–390.

23. In this work we will be citing from Petrus de Palude.... *In quantum sententiarum*. (Venice: per Beontum Locatellum Bergumensem, 1493). There is a precedent for this approach: Martin Grabmann extracted Durandus' opinions from Peter de Palude's commentary in his "Circa historiam distinctionis essentiae et existentiae," *Acta Pont. Academiae Romanae S. Thomas Aq. Et Religionis Catholicae*, nova series, 1 (1934): 42–58.

24. Transcriptions of these lists have been edited and published by Joseph Koch as "Articuli nonaginta tres extracti ex Durandi de S. Porciano O.P. primo scripto super Sententia et examinati per magistros et baccalarios Ordinis," and "Articuli in quibus magister Durandus deviat a doctrina venerabilis doctoris nostri fratris Thomae," in his *Kleine Schriften*, 2 vols., *Storia e letteratura raccolta adi studi e testi* 127 (Romae: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1973): 2: 53–71 and 73–118. See also Peter de Palude and John of Naples, "Articuli in quibus mgr. Durandus deviat a doctrina venerabilis doctoris nostri fratris," *Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat.* 6736 (f. 113ra–133rb).

25. Information on the sentences commentaries of Natalis, Durandus and Palude, including manuscripts, locations and editions, is available in Friedrich Stegmüller, *Repertorium Commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi* (Herbipoli: Apud Ferdinandum Schoningh, 1947) 1: nos. 192–195, 348 and 677. Stegmüller's work was supplemented by Victorin Doucet, *Commentaries sur les Sentences, supplément au Répertoire de M. Frédéric Stegmüller* (Florentiae: Ad Claras Aquas: Typ. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1954): nos. 192, 195, 348 and 677. Of the two commentaries upon which this chapter is based, the first is Hervaeus Natalis, *In quatuor Libros sententiarum Commentaria*, ed. Dionysius Moreau (Paris: Moreau, 1546; reprinted Westmead: Gregg Press, 1966). Hereafter denoted by (Moreau) following the *Sentences* citation. Completed in around 1309, this edition of Natalis' commentary is an *ordinatio* based on an earlier *reportatio* of his lectures on the *Sentences* during the years 1302–1303. Earlier, unedited versions of Natalis' original *Sentences* lectures are available in manuscript form. Interestingly enough, all versions are incomplete. Natalis' failure to complete his commentary on the last two books of the *Sentences* may have been due, at least initially, to the struggle between Philip IV and Boniface VIII which generated so much turmoil within the University of Paris during this time. For discussion, see Scott Swanson, "Emerging concepts of jurisdiction, sacramental orders, and property rights among Dominican thinkers from Thomas Aquinas to Hervaeus Natalis (1250–1320)," (Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1988), 571. See also A. Fries, "Quaestiones super quantum librum sententiarum Hervaeo Natali OP vindicatae," *Angelicum*, 13/4 (1936): 498–533. Citations for Durandus' third redaction of his commentary will be taken from Durandus of Saint Pourçain, *In petri Lombardi sententias theologicas commentariorum libri IIII* (Venetiis: ex typographica Guerraea, 1571). Hereafter designated by (Guerraea) following Durandus' *Sentences* citation. Because Durandus wrote three redactions of his commentary, some recourse has been made to Durandus of St. Pourçain, "Epilogus postremi scripti in IV libros

Sententiarum,” Vat. Lat. 147 (f. 147r–148v); “Scriptum super I libro Sententiarum,” Vat. Lat. 1072 (f. 1r–123r) and “Scriptum super IV libro Sententiarum,” Vat. Lat. 1074 (f. 147r–148v; f. 287–423r).

26. Palémon Glorieux, *La littérature quodlibétique*, Bibliothèque thomiste, 5, 21 (Kain: Le Saulchoir, 1925–35). Many of Natalis’ citations will be taken from Hervaeus Natalis, *Subtilissima Hervei Natalis Britonis theologi acutissimi quolibeta undecim cum octo ipsius profundissimis tractatibus infra per ordinem descriptis*, ed. M. A. Zimara (Venice: 1513; reprinted, Ridgewood, N.J.: Gregg, 1966). Hereafter designated by (Zimara) following the quodlibetal citation. Because Zimara’s edition does not contain all of Natalis’ quodlibetals, some reference will be made to Hervaeus Natalis, “Quaestiones Quodlibetales nonnullae,” Vat. Lat. 772 (f. 1rb–121rb). For a discussion of Natalis’ quodlibets, see Ludwig Hödl, “Die Quodlibeta minora des Hervaeus Natalis,” *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift*, 6 (1955): 215–229. The vast majority of Durandus’ quodlibetal citations are drawn from two printed sources: Durandus of St. Pourçain, *Disputationes Durandi et anonymi cuiusdam*, ed. Joseph Koch and Takeshiro Takada, Series of hitherto unedited texts of medieval thinkers 2 (Kyoto: [s.n.], 1965); *Quodlibeta Avenionensia tria*, ed. Prospero T. Stella, Textus et studia in historiam scholasticae cura pontificii Athenaei Salesiani (Zurich: Pas-Verlag, 1965); and *Quol. Paris I (Q. 1 – Q. IV)*, ed. Takeshiro Takada, Series of hitherto unedited texts of medieval thinkers 4 (Kyoto: Doshisha University, 1968). Supplementing these are: Durandus of St. Pourçain, “Quolibet Avenionsia I, quaestionem 3,” Vat. Lat. 1075 (f. 1r–15v); “Quodlibeti Avenionensis II,” Vat. Lat. 1075 (f. 15v–22v); “Quodlibeti Avenionensis III,” Vat. Lat. 1075 (f. 23v–31r); “Quodlibeti Parisiensis I,” Vat. Lat. 1075 (f. 31v–38v); and “Quodlibeti Parisiensis I,” Vat. Lat. 1076 (f. 13r–19r).

27. Auguste Pelzer, *Codices Vaticani latini*, codices 679–1134, tom. 2, pars prior (Bibliotheca Vaticana: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1931): 83, no. 772; 167, no. 817; 627, no. 1072; 630, no. 1074; 631, no. 1075; and 634, no. 1076. Thus, in addition to the manuscripts cited supra, reference has also been made to Durandus of St. Pourçain, “Tractatus de habitus,” Vat. Lat. 1076 (f. 1r–9v) and “Utrum theologia dicat unum habitum tantum,” Vat. Lat. 817 (f. 75rb–80rb); as well as Hervaeus Natalis, “Defensio doctrinae fratris Thomae,” Vat. Lat. 817 (f. 1r–75r); “Quaestio de relatione contra Durandum,” Vat. Lat. 772 (ff. 157r–162r); “Quattuor questiones theologicae,” Vat. Lat. 817 (75r–93r); “Queritur in utrum in divinis relatio realiter differat ab essentia,” Vat. Lat. 817 (f. 182v–183r); “Quinque responsa ad totidem articulos ex Durandi de S. Porciano commentario in Sententias excerptos,” Vat. Lat. 817 (f. 93r–97r); and “Tractatus de relationibus,” Vat. Lat. 817 (f. 53r–70v).

28. The one previous work which focuses squarely upon Aquinas’ acquisition of *auctoritas* is Marie-Dominique Chenu’s, “<<Maitres>> Thomas es-t-il une <<Autorité>>?: Note sur deux lieux théologiques au XIV^e siècle,” *Revue Thomiste* 30 (1925): 187–194. However, the bulk of the article is concerned not with the origins or initial development of Aquinas’ *auctoritas* among the Friar Preachers, but deals instead with the subsequent attempt of the Dominican Order to extend Aquinas’ *auctoritas* during the Immaculate Conception controversy of the late fourteenth century.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1. Humbert Vicaire, *Saint Dominic and his times*, translated by Katherine Pond (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965), originally published in French as *Histoire de St. Dominique*, and Guy Bedouelle, *Saint Dominic: The Grace of the Word* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1987).

2. Ralph Bennet, *The early Dominicans: studies in thirteenth-century Dominican history*, Cambridge studies in medieval life and thought, ed. G.G. Coulton (Cambridge: The University Press, 1937) and Alan White, “The foundation of the Order of Preachers and its historical setting,” in *The way of the preacher*, ed. Simon Tugwell (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1979), 97–110. For the Dominican governmental structure, see Ernest Barker, *The Dominican Order and Convocation: a study of the growth of representation in the Church in the thirteenth century* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913).

3. See Introduction, 4, n.2.

4. See particularly Leonard Boyle, “Notes on the education of the *fratres communes* in the Dominican Order in the thirteenth century,” in his *Pastoral care, clerical education and canon law, 1200–1400* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1981): 157–179. See also Isnard Frank, “Zur studien organisation der Dominikanerprovin Teutonia in der ersten Haelfte des 14 Jahrhunderts; und zum studiengang des Seilegen Heinrich Seuse, O.P.,” in *Heinrich Seuse: Studien zum 600 Todestag 1366–1966*, ed. E. M. Filthaut (Koln: Albertus Magnus, 1966): 39–69; Andrew G. Little, “Educational organization of the mendicant orders in England,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, n.s. 8 (1894): 49–70; F. D. Nealy, *The administration of Dominican education in the first two centuries of its foundation, 1221–1451* (Ph.D. dissertation, Aquinas Institute of Philosophy, River Forest, IL, 1957); Maura O’Carroll, “The educational organization of the Dominicans in England and Wales, 1221–1345: a multi disciplinary approach,” *AFP* 40

(1990): 23–62; and Celestin Douais, *Essai sur l'organisation des études dans l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs au XIII^e et au XIV^e siècle* (Paris: Picard, 1884).

5. The seminal history of medieval universities is, of course, Hastings Rashdall, *The universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1895). The study of medieval universities since Rashdall has been extensive. See John Fletcher and Julian Deahl, "European universities, 1300–1700: the development of research, 1969–1981," in *Rebirth, Reform and Resilience*, ed. James Kittleson (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984): 324–357.

6. See M.-M. Dufeil, *Guillaume de Saint-Amour et la polémique universitaire parisienne, 1250–1259* (Paris: Picard, 1972); Decima Douie, *The conflict between the seculars and mendicants at the University of Paris in the thirteenth century* (London: Aquinas Society, 1954) and Yves Congar, "Aspects ecclésiologiques de la querelle entre mendiants et séculiers dans la seconde moitié du XIII^e et XIV^e siècle," *AHDLM* 28 (1961): 35–151.

7. See especially Dieter Berg, *Armut und Wissenschaft: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Studienwesens der Bettelorden im 13. Jahrhundert*, *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 15 (Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann, 1977). See also William Courtenay, *Schools and scholars in fourteenth century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987): 61–66; Isnard Frank, "Hausstudium und Universitätsstudium der Wiener Dominikaner bis 1500," *Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte* 127 (Vienna, 1968); Michael Sheehan, "The Religious Orders, 1220–1370," in *The Early Oxford Schools*, ed. J. Catto (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984): 193–223 and Jacques Verger, "Studia et universités," in *Le scuole degli ordini mendicanti* (Todi: Presso l'accademia Tudertina, 1978): 173–204. See also the somewhat dated Hastings Rashdall, "The Friars Preachers and the Universities," in *Collectanea*, 2, ed. M. Burrows, (Oxford: Oxford Historical Society, 1890): 195–273.

8. M. Michèle Mulchahey, "The Dominican *studium* system and the universities of Europe in the thirteenth century: a relationship redefined," in *Manuels, Programmes de Cours et Techniques d'Enseignement dans les Universités Médiévales*, ed. Jacqueline Hamesse (Louvain-la Neuve: Publications de L'Institut d'Etudes Médiévales, 1994): 279–324.

9. Marie-Dominique Chenu, *Nature, man and society in the twelfth century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968): 239–269

10. Arno Borst, *Die Kathares* (Freiburg: Herder, 1991); Jean Duvernoy, *La religion des Cathares* (Toulouse: Privat, 1976) and *L'histoire des Cathares* (Toulouse: Privat, 1979); and, most recently, Philippe Roy's pro-cathar, *Les Cathares: histoire et spiritualité* (Paris: Dervy, 1993).

11. For the organizational structure of the Albigensian sect, see Michael Hanssler, "Katharismus in Südfrankreich. Struktur der Sekte und inquisitorische Verfolgung in der zweiten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts," (Ph.D. diss., Regensburg University, 1991) and Anton Dondaine, "La hiérarchie cathare en Italie" *AFP* 19 (1949): 280–312; 20 (1950): 234–324. The greatest weakness of the Cathar church was its proclivity towards schism.

12. The three papal legates were Abbot Amaury of Cîteaux, Peter of Castelnau and Raoul of Fontfroide. *Patrologiae cursus completus: series latina*, ed. J. Migne (Paris: 1844–1891) 215: 1510–3; 216: 289–93. Hereafter cited as *PL*. For the activities of the legates, see Hinnebusch, *History*, 1, 20–36 and Mandonnet, *Saint Dominique*, 1: 43–45.

13. Primary source material for this period of Dominic's life is limited, consisting chiefly of records of the canonization process, supplemented by hagiographical sources and early biographies. The most recently published is *Miracula sancti Dominici mandato magistri Berengarii collecta; Petri Calo legendae sancti Dominici*, ed. Simon Tugwell, *MOPH* 26 (Roma: Istituto Storico Domenicano, 1997). The fullest near-contemporary account is Jordan of Saxony's *Libellus de principiis ord. predicatorum*, edited H. C. Scheeben, *MOPH* 26 (Rome, 1935). The *Libellus* has been edited and translated by Simon Tugwell as *On the beginnings of the Order of Preachers*, Dominican Sources (Dublin: Dominican Publications, 1982). For further information on the *Libellus*, see Christopher Brook, "St. Dominic and his first biographer," in *Medieval Church and Society* (London: Sidu, 1971): 214–232. See also *St. Dominic: biographical documents*, ed. F. C. Lehrer (Washington, D.C.: The Thomist Press, 1964) and *Cartulaire; ou, Histoire diplomatique de St. Dominique*, 3 vols., ed. François Balme, Paul Lelalider and A. I. Collomb, (Paris: Aux Bureaux de L'Année Dominicaine, 1893–1901). For a discussion of the available primary sources, see Simon Tugwell, "Introduction," *Early Dominicans: selected writings* (New York: Paulist Press, 1982): 1–49. Records of Dominic's canonization process are contained in Angelus Walz, ed., "Processus canonizationis S. Dominici apud Bononiam," and "Processus canonizationis S. Dominici apud Tholosam," *MOPH* 16 (Rome: 1935). A critical discussion of the testimony and early documentation of Dominic's canonization is contained in Raymond Creytens, "Le <<Testament de S. Dominique>> dans la littérature Dominicaine ancienne et moderne," *AFP* 43 (1973): 29–72.

14. Marie-Hubert Vicaire, "Innocent III, Diego, and Dominic in 1206," in *St. Dominic and his work* (St.

Louis: Herder, 1944): 405–421.

15. Simon Tugwell, "Introduction," *Early Dominicans*, 10.

16. Marie-Humbert Vicaire, "L'action de l'enseignement et de prédication des Mendians vis-à-vis des cathares," *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 20 (1985): 277–304.

17. For the relationship between Dominic and Innocent III, see Marie-Humbert Vicaire, "Innocent III a-t-il néconnu Dominique?" *Mémoire Dominicaine* 1 (1992): 129–143 and his much earlier, "St. Dominic and the Pope in 1215," in *St. Dominic and his work* (St. Louis: Herder, 1944): 422–446. See also Jean-Pierre Renard, "La formation et la designation des Predicateurs au debut de l'Ordre des precheurs (1215–1237)," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Fribourg, 1977): 61–62.

18. Fulk of Toulouse, "Lettre d'approbation de l'Ordre," in *Saint Dominique. La vie Apostolique, Chrétiens de tous les temps*, ed. by Marie-Humbert Vicaire (Paris: Cerf, 1957), 151–152 and M. H. Laurent, *Monumenta historica S. Dominici*, MOPH 15, no. 60 (Hereafter cited as *Monumenta*).

19. *Historia diplomatica*, Laurent, 66–67, no. 40: "Notum sit omnibus presentibus et futuris quod nos F., Dei gratia tolosane sedis minister humilis, ad extirpandam hereticam pravitatem et vicia expellenda et fidei regulam edocendam et homines sanis moribus imbuendos, instituimus predicatorum in episcopatu nostro fratrem Dominicum et socios eius, qui, in paupertate evangelica, pedites religiose proposuerunt incedere et veritatis evangelice verbum predicare ..."

20. Honorius III, "Religiosam vitam," *Bullarium ordinis fratrum praedicatorum*, edited by Thomas Ripoll and Antonio Bremond (Rome: Hieronymi Mainardi, 1729) 1, 1. Hereafter cited as *BOP. Monumenta*, Laurent, 1, no. 74. See Marie-Humbert Vicaire, "La Bulle de confirmation des Prêcheurs," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 47 (1952): 176–192 and *Saint Dominic and his Times*: 219–223.

21. *Historia diplomatica*, Laurent, 92, no. 79.

22. *Monumenta diplomatica S. Dominici*, comp. Vladimir Koudelka, MOPH, 24 (Romae: Apud Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1966): 145–146, no. 143. Hereafter cited as *Monumenta*, Koudelka.

23. Most recently, Marie-Humbert Vicaire, "Lo spirito di S. Domenico e la sua intenzione nella fondazione dei Fratri Predicatori," *Bollettino di S. Domenico* 65 (1984): 47–51; 91–94; 161–163; 188–196.

24. The papal bulls according privileges to the Dominican Order during the Middle Ages are catalogued in Dominikus Planzer, "Die Tabula Privilegiorum O. P.," *AFP* 10 (1940): 222–257.

25. Honorius III, "Gratium omnium," in *BOP*, ed. Ripoll-Bremond, no. 77. See also Marie-Humbert Vicaire, "Predicantibus-Predicatoribus: La bull du 21 Janvier 1217 (H317)," *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 1, 44–46 and R. Ladner, "Le nom et l'idée d'ordo Praedicatorum," in *St. Dominique*, 2: 49–68.

26. Honorius III, "Postulatis," in *BOP*, 1, 14 and *MOPH*, 15, 164, n. 142. See also P. Gy, "Le statut ecclésiologique de l'apostolat des Prêcheurs et des Mineurs avant la querelle des Mendians," *RSPT* 59 (1979): 79–88, especially 84 and Guy Bedouelle, *St Dominic*: 195–197.

27. Marie-Humbert Vicaire, "L'Ordre de S. Dominique en 1215," *AFP* (1984): 5–38.

28. • Three interesting treatments of how the preaching of the Dominicans developed are contained in *Prediche all donne del secolo XIII: testi di Umberto da Romans, Gilberto da Tournai, Stefano di Borbone*, ed. C. Casagrande (Milan: Bompiani, 1978); David d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985); and Daniel Lesnick, *Preaching in medieval Florence: The social world of Franciscan and Dominican spirituality* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia, 1989). Lesnick's book is heavily criticized in a book review by Ronald Zawilla in *Manuscripta* 35: 1 (March, 1991): 59–60. See also Katherine Tachau, "Looking gravely at Dominican puns: the sermons of Robert Holcot and Ralph Friseby," *Traditio* 46 (1991): 337–345.

29. Louis Bataillon, "Early scholastic and mendicant preaching as exegesis of Scripture," in *Ad litteram: authoritative texts and their medieval readers*, ed. Mark D. Jordan and Kent Emery Jr., Notre Dame Conferences in Medieval Studies, 3 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992): 172–175.

30. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Norman P. Tanner, S.J., 2 vols. (London: Sheed & Ward: 1990)1, 10: "Ne nimia religionum diversitas gravem in ecclesia Dei confusionem inducat, firmiter prohibemus, ne quis de caetero novam religionem inveniat, sed quicumque voluerit ad religionem converti, unam de approbatis assumat. Similiter qui voluerit religiosam domum fundare de novo, regulam et institutionem accipiat de religionibus approbatis." See also Marie-Humbert Vicaire, "La Règle de S. Augustin a la fondation de l'Ordre des Prêcheurs," *La Vie Spirituelle* 145 (1991): 261–279 for background.

31. C. H. Lawrence, *The Friars: The impact of the early mendicant movement on western society* (New York: Longman, 1994), 71. For further discussion, see Simon Tugwell, "Friars and canons: the earliest canons," in *Monastic Studies*, 2, ed. Judith Loades (Bangor: Headstart, 1992): 193–207.

32. Jean Châtillon, *Le mouvement canonial au Moyen Age. Réform de l'Eglise, Spiritualité et Culture*, Etudes réunies par Patrice Sicard (Paris: Brepols, 1992): 221–236.

33. Simon Tugwell, "Introduction," *Early Dominicans*, 19.

34. For a survey of relatively recent literature, see C. Delcorno, "Rassegna di studi sulla predicazione medievale e umanistica (1970–80)," *Lettere italiana* (1981): 253–276. For general introductions to the topic of preaching in the Middle Ages, see Jean Longère, *La prédication médiévale* (Paris: Etudes augustinienes, 1983) and, "Le pouvoir de prêcher et le contenu de la prédication dans l'occident chrétien," in *Prédication et propaganda au Moyen Age: Islam, Byzance, Occident: Penn-Paris-Dumbarton Oaks Colloquia*, 3, session des 20–25 octobre 1980 (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1983): 165–172; Michael Menzel, "Predigt und Predigtorganisation im Mittelalter," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 11 (1991): 337–384; and John O'Malley, "Introduction: Medieval Preaching," in *De ore Domini: Preacher and word in the Middle Ages*, Studies in Medieval Culture, 27 (Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Press, 1989): 1–11.

35. Bennett, *Early Dominicans*, 179–191 and Marie-Humbert Vicaire, "Sacerdoce et prédication aux origines de l'ordre des prêcheurs," *RSPT* 64 (1980): 241–254.

36. See above, p. 9, n. 12.

37. For the version of the Constitutions of Premontre used by Dominic, see Antonius Thomas, "Une version des statuts de Prélmontré au début du XIII^e siècle," *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 55 (1979): 153–170.

38. The *acta* passed by Dominican general chapters before 1220 are not extant. For the activity of the first General Chapter of 1216, see Girardi de Fracheto, *Chronica Ordinis*, MOPH 1; Galuagni de la Flamma, *Chronica Ordinis*, MOPH, 2. For the Dominican general chapters which took place between 1216–1220, see *Iordanis de Saxonia Opera ad res ordinis spectantia*, ed. B. Berthier (Friburg: Helvetiorum, 1981): 1–41.

39. *Acta*, 1, 1220,1–2: "Tunc eciam ordinatum est ne possessiones vel redditus de cetero tenerent fratres nostri sed et hiis renunciarent quos habuerant in partibus Tholosanis. Unde per constitutionem perpetuam abdicatis omnibus temporalibus resignando tam presentibus redditus quam futurus ordo fratrum predicatorum paupertatem voluntariam est professus." For discussion, see Marie-Humbert Vicaire, "Les origines dominicaines de la mendicité religieuse," *Vie dominicaine* 35 (1975): 195–206; 259–279. The Dominicans acknowledged the legitimacy of ownership in common. This was true of all religious orders under the *Rule of St. Benedict*, as well as those orders which were under some variation of the *Rule of St. Augustine* (i.e., the canons and the three non-Franciscan mendicant orders).

40. Henri Denifle, "Die Constitutionen de Predigerordens in der Redaction Raimunds von Penafort," *ALKG* 5 (1889): 533–564.

41. See Luc Verheijen, *La règle de saint Augustin*, 2 vols. (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1967). For the historical background of the Rule and its various editions, see George Lawless, O.S.A., *Augustine of Hippo and his monastic Rule* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987). This work contains both the Latin text and translations.

42. *Acta*, I, 14: "Item Inchoamus has constitutiones. Generale statutum ordinis vel consuetudinem diu obtentam et communiter in ordine approbatam. Neque magister ordinis, neque priores provinciales aliquatenus valeant immutare nisi per tria capitula fuerit approbatum."

43. Galbraith, "Introduction," *Constitution*, 1.

44. Antoninus H. Thomas, "La profession religieuse des Dominicains. Formule, cérémonies, histoire," *AFP* 39 (1969): 5–52.

45. Bedouelle, *St. Dominic*, 229–243.

46. Hinnebusch, *History*, 1, 86.

47. *Constitutiones antiquae*, Thomas, 311: "Cum ordo noster specialiter ob predicationem et animarum salutem ab initio noscatur institutus fuisse, et studium nostrum ad hoc principaliter ardentius summo opere debeat intendere ut proximorum animabus possimus utiles esse." The General Chapter of 1220 inserted this preface at the beginning of the *Constitutions*. Since 1220, the proclamation has begun the preface of every version of the Dominican Constitutions.

48. *Acta*, 1, 1256, 81: "Quod fratres nostri vocentur fratres predicatorum et non aliis nominibus."

49. See D. E. Showalter, "The business of salvation: authority and representation in the thirteenth-century Dominican Order," *Catholic Historical Review* (1972): 556–574.

50. Galbraith, *Constitution*, 85–109.

51. See above, p. 9, n. 13.

52. Extant primary sources relevant to the medieval master generals can be found in *Litterae Encyclicae Magistrorum generalium ordinis Praedicatorum*, 1227–1375, ed. B.M. Reichert, in MOPH, 5 (Rome, Santa Sabin, 1900) and Daniel Mortier's invaluable eight volume *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs* (Paris: A. Picara, 1903–1920). For specific studies, see William Hinnebusch, "The English Dominicans and the masters general of the late fourteenth century," in *Xenia*

53. Most notably, Ralph Bennett, *The early Dominicans*, 165.

54. David Knowles, *The religious orders in England*, 3 vols., (Cambridge: University Press, 1948–1959), 1: 159.

55. *Acta*, 1, 1236, 8: “Confirmamus hanc constitutionem quod in constitutionibus ubi dicitur ea propter unitati et pace etc. volumus et declaramus ut constitutiones nostre non obligent nos ad culpam set ad penam nisi propter contemptum vel preceptum.”

56. *Ibid.*, 1, 1236, 7: “Item. Ubit in constitutionibus non deponatur magister nisi pro heresi radatur pro heresi et ponatur pro crimine.”

57. *Ibid.*, 1, 1236, 6: “Magister aut priores provinciales non mutant acta capituli generalis vel provincialis nisi forte in speciali causa necessaria et utili.”

58. *Ibid.*, 1, 1254, 66: “Confirmus has constitutiones. In capitulo de generali ubi dicitur de magistro seorsum corrigant et emendent addatur qui coram ipsis humiliter se prostemens veniam faciat et stans de suis excessibus se accuset et diffinitores audiant accusationes. Et hec habet iii capitula.”

59. *Ibid.*, 1, 1254, 71: “Mandat magister ordinis prioribus provincialibus et diffinitoribus capitulorum provincialium universis quod singulis annis quam diu ipse fuerit in officio mittant ei ad capitulorum generale per diffinitores suos acta capitulorum provincialium.”

60. *Ibid.*, 1, 1236, 7: “Conventus qui mittit accusationes ad capitulum generale vel provinciale scribat de quolibet articulo numerum et nomina accusantium et si accusat de visu vel auditu et nullus accuset nisi dicat a quo audierit.”

61. *Ibid.*, 1, 1255, 76: “Fratres qui scribunt vel dictant literas mittendas capitulo generali breviter et succincte scribant ne propter prolixitatem literarum capitulorum in aliis negociis impediatur nomina eiam sua et conventuum et provinciarum suarum plene exprimat in literis quas scribunt magistro vel capitulo.” See also *Acta* 1, 1285, 229.

62. *Ibid.*, 1, 1236, 10: “Inchoamus hanc constitutionem ut ... mittantur de provincia in provinciam visitatores.”

63. *Ibid.*, 1, 1272, 164: “Iniungimus autem omnibus prioribus conventualibus ut modis omnibus provideant et procurent habere omnes indulgencias et privilegia bullata ad ordinem pertinencia in communii vel saltem eorum transcripta sigillis authenticis sigillata vel per manum publicam roborata.”

64. *Ibid.*, 1, 1239, 11: “Approbamus hanc constitutionem. De tercio in tercium annum mittantur visitatores per provincias a capitulo generali qui habeant potestatem corrigendi excessus priorum conventualium et aliorum fratrum et. ...”

65. *Ibid.*, 1, 1240, 17: “Visitatoribus qui non visitaverunt iniungimus V dies in pane et aqua et V psalteria et totidem disciplinas in capitulo et illis qui non scripserunt ut debuerunt iii dies et tres disciplinas.”

66. Hinnebusch, *History*, 1, 202.

67. *Acta*, 1, 1267, 139: “Curent priores provinciales mittere novicios ad conventus in quibus in moribus, devocione et religiones possint commodius instrui et melius informari.” The practice was later discouraged. See *Acta*, 1, 1300, 297.

68. Knowles, *Religious orders*, 1, 218–219. The Oxford friars were disciplined in 1261. See *Acta*, 1, 1261, 110.

69. *Acta*, 1, 1296, 281: “Cum fratres Nove civitatis de provincia Theotonie contra districtas inhibiciones magister ordinis terminos fratrum de Ungaria ingredi persumpserint magnas eisdem fratribus molestias et dampna multiplicia continuatis temporibus inferendo imponimus eis qui miserunt et eis qui intraverunt scienter terminos supradictos v dies i pane et aqua v missas v letanias et quicumque ex eis de cetero predictos terminos ingressi fuerint ad predicandum vel mendicandum provincialis Theotonie vel eius viacarius eos de conventu predicto removere teneatur cum sibi fuerit intimatum.”

70. *Ibid.*, 1, 1235, 5: “Fratres nullo modo ostendant acta capituli illis qui non sunt de ordine nostro.”

71. *Ibid.*, 1, 1243, 26: “Fratres non procurent literas apud principes prelatos seu magnates de mutacione sui status, vel aliorum fratrum.”

72. *Ibid.*, 1, 1234, 5: “Ad dilectionem internam fratrum minorum melius conservandam volumus ut infra terminos cuiuscumque ministri provincialis eligatur unus de fratribus minoribus a fratribus nostris et unus de nostris ab eis si eis placuerit. Et isti duo vice ministri provincialis eorum et prioris provincialis nostri excessus ubicumque factos corrigant et emendent.” Despite the constant friction between the two orders, the Dominican *Constitutions* ordered that the friars minor always be made welcome within Dominican convents (Dist. 2, cap. 13). There is a Franciscan corollary in the Franciscan *Constitutions* (Assissi, Cap. 4, item 13). See “Statuta generali ordinis edita in capitulo generali an 1354 Assissii celebrato,” ed. Michael Bihl, *AfH* 35 (1936): 35–112; 177–253.

73. *Acta*, 1, 1294, 276: "Cum fr. Arnaldus de Prato lector Tholosanus in irreverentiam minorum cardinalium nostri ordinis dicitur quadam cancionibus finxisse committimus venerabili patri magistro ordinis quia presens non est in capitulo ut de hoc inquirat diligenter et graviter puniat secundum quod eum invenerit excessisse." An account of Munio's trials and tribulations is contained in Peter Linehan, *The ladies of Zamorra* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State Press, 1997).

74. The basic structures of Dominican government were adopted in the thirteenth century by the Franciscans, the Carmelites and the Augustinians. For the Dominican influence on the Jesuits see, for example, A. Hsü, *Dominican presence in the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus: A study of Dominican influence of the textual make-up of the Jesuit Constitutions in regard to the formation of novices and the rules for the novice master* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1971).

75. For the significance of the Dominican constitutions within the history of religious orders, see Knowles, *Religious Orders*, 1, 150–162.

76. *Acta*, 1, 1290, 258: "Ordinationem factam de non veniendo ad capitula generalia vel provincialia in preterito capitulo innovamus et addimus novam penam. ..."

77. *Ibid.*, 1, 1302, 316: "Fratribus singulis qui venerunt ad capitulum generale sine licencia magistris ordinis vel prioris provincialis Lombardie vel alicuius diffinitoris licencia iniungimus .vii. Dies in pane et aqua indispensabiliter infra .vii. Septimanas proximas ieiundandes."

78. The overall pattern of Dominican expansion is discussed in Lawrence, *The Friars*, 102–108. For Germany, see J. B. Freed, *The Friars and German society in the thirteenth century* (Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy, 1977); for France, see R. W. Emery, *The Friars in Medieval France. A catalogue of French mendicant convents, 1200–1550* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962); and for England, see David Knowles and R. Neville Hadcock, *Medieval religious houses: England and Wales* (London: Longmans, Green, 1953). On the general relationship between mendicant settlement and the towns in France, see Jacques LeGoff, "Ordres mendiants et urbanisation dans la France médiévale," *Annales* 25 (1970): 924–965 and Jean-Claude Schmitt, "Où en est l'enquête Ordres mendiants et urbanisation dans la France médiévale," in *Stellung und Wirksamkeit der Bettelorden in der städtischen Gesellschaft*, ed. Kaspar Elm (Berlin: Duncker & Humboldt, 1981): 13–18.

79. These and the following figures are taken from L.A. Redigonda, "Fratrī della Predicatori," *Dizionario degli Istituti di Perfezione*, vol 4, 924. It should be noted, however, that Hinnebusch calculates the number of friars to be much higher. See Hinnebusch, *History*, 1, 280–281 and 330–331.

80. Bernard Montagnes, "L'organisation territoriale des frères prêcheurs," in *Dominicains et Dominicaines en Alsace XIII^e–XX^e siècle. Actes du colloque de Guebwiller 8–9 avril 1994* (Conseil Général, Réussir le Haut-Rhin, Colmar, 1996): 21–30

81. Lists of Dominican priories in existence in 1277, 1303 and 1358 are contained in Angelus Walz' *Compendium historiae ordinis praedicatorum* (Rome: Athenaeum, 1930).

82. Emery, *Friars in Medieval France*, 16–17.

83. *Constitutiones antiquae*, Thomas, 358: "Conventus citra numerum duodenarium et sine priore et doctore non mittatur."

84. Vicaire, "La développement de la province," 60–62.

85. Philip F. Mulhern, *The early Dominican laybrother*, Ph.D. diss., Laval University, Quebec, 1944 (Laval: Quebec Presses Universitaires, 1944).

86. For the socio-economic background of the Franciscans, see Lawrence, *The Friars*, 34–35 and Jacques Paul, "La signification social du Franciscanisme," in *Mouvements franciscains et société française XII^e et XX^e siècles: études présentées à la table ronde du CNRS, 23 octobre 1982*, Beauchesne Religions 14, ed. A. Vauchez, (Paris: Beauchesne, 1984): 9–25.

87. Heinrich Finke, *Ungedruckte Dominikanerbriebe des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1891), 10.

88. Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars*, 262.

89. *Acta*, 1, 1244, 28. "Ubi dicitur in constitutionibus quod si alterius religionis inventus fuerit, non recipiatur in ordine nostro nisi per provinciale capitulum cum eo fuerit dispensatum totum istud removeatur."

90. *Ibid.*, 1, 1296, 281: "Cum dominus papa preceperit et capitulum generale ordinaverit quod fratres professi in ordine Heremitarum ad ordinem nostrum non recipiantur volumus quod fratres a talibus receptionibus abstineant cum sint ipso facto irriti et inanes."

91. *Ibid.*, 1, 1276, 186–187. "Magister ordinis de consilio et assensu diffinitorum interdicat prioribus et fratribus universis ne aliquem professum in ordine Heremitarum sancti Augustini et sancti Guillelmi recipiant cum nobis per dominum papam in virtute obediencie fuerit specialiter interdictum."

92. BOP, 1, 141.

93. Bulls prohibiting the transfer of Dominicans to other orders can be found in BOP, 1, 12, no. 19; 19,

no.5; 130, no. 40; 138, no. 60; and 303, no. 91.

94. *Acta*, 1, 1296, 280: "Ordinamus quod frater qui petit licenciam ad alium ordinem transeundi et in hoc persistit privetur omnibus preter aliam penitenciam imponendam eidem."

95. *Ibid.*, 1, 1259, 97: "Fratres qui transierunt ad alios in quibus perserverant ad multam familiaritatem a fratribus non admittantur."

96. Marguerite Aron, *Saint Dominic's successor: The life of Blessed Jordan of Saxony, Master General of the Dominican Order, 1222-1327* (St. Louis: Herder, 1955): 31-32.

97. Gerard di Frachet, *Vitae Fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum necnon Ordinis ab anno MXXIII usque ad annum MCCLIV*, ed. B.M. Reichert, MOPH, 1, (Rome, 1897), 141: "Cum semel queretur ab eo cur artiste frequenter ordinem intrarent et theologi et decretiste tardius, respondit: <<Facilius inebriantur bono vino rustici qui aquam conserventer bibere, quam nobiles et cives qui vina fortiora non reputant quia in usu habent. Artiste quidem tota ebdomada aquam Aristotelis et aliorum philosophorum bibunt; unde cum in sermone domnice vel festi verba Christi vel suorum hauserint, statim inebriati vino Spiritus Sancti capiuntur et non tantum sua sed et se ipsos Deo donant. Isti autem theologi frequenter audiunt talia et ideo contigit eis, sicut rustico sacriste, qui ex frequenti transitu ante altare irreverenter se habet et ad illum dorsum vertit frequenter, extraneis inclinantibus reverenter>>."

98. Lawrence, *The Friars*, 72.

99. Edward Tracy Brett, *Humbert of Romans: his life and views of thirteenth century society*, Studies and texts, 67 (Toronoto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1984), 16.

100. Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars*, 262.

101. John van Engen, "The Christian Middle Ages as an historiographical problem," *American historical review* 91 (1986): 519-552. For concrete examples of the *Christianitas* approach to preaching, see Carlo Delcorno, "Origini del predicazione francescana," in *Francesco d'Assisi e francescanesimo dal 1216 al 1226. Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale, Assisi 1976*, Testimonianze sull'ebraismo 1, (Assisi: Rome: B. Caracci, 1977): 127-166.

102. Pierre Mandonnet, "La crise scolaire au début du XIII^e siècle et le fondation de l'Ordre de Frères Prêcheurs," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 15 (1914): 34-49.

103. *Acta*, II, 229: "Cum ordo noster a suis primordiis propter eminensiam sciencie singulariter floruerit." This theme is also present in many of the acts of the provincial chapters of Provence. See, for example, the item in 1301 in *Acta capitulorum provincialium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 463.

104. Brett, *Humbert of Romans*, 41.

105. *Constitutiones* (Rome: 1650), 241: "Studium Religioni nostrae quam maxime congruit. ..." and "Secundo, studium Religioni nostrae necessarium est, quoniam ipsa est instituta ad tradendum aliis contemplata per doctrinam; quae sane res fieri non potest sine studio scripturarum eamque contemplation.... Ignorantia quae est cunctorum errorum, a cunctis vitanda est, et maxime ab his qui officium docendi in populo susceperunt."

106. Interestingly enough, in direct contrast to the educational practices of other religious orders at the time, Dominic really intended that all of the friars receive a solid education. See Leonard Boyle, "Notes on the education of the *fratres communes* in the Dominican Order in the thirteenth century," in *Xenia medii aevi historiam illustrantia oblata Thomae Kaeppli O.P.*, ed. Raymond Creytens and Pius Künzle, Storia e letteratura (Rome: 1979), 1: 249 - 267. Reprinted as item 6 in *Pastoral care, clerical education and canon law 1200-1400* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1981). See also M.-Michèle Mulchahey, "More notes on the education of the *fratres communes* in the Dominican Order: Elias de Ferreriis of Salagnac's *Libellus de doctrina fratrum*," in *A distinct voice: medieval studies in honor of Leonard E. Boyle, O.P.*, ed. Jacqueline Brown and William P. Stoneman, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997): 328-372, which adds to Boyle's thesis.

107. *Acta canonizationis s. Dominici*: 91-194, MOPH 16 (1935): 146-147, no. 29.

108. Hinnebusch, *History*, 2, 5.

109. Jordan of Saxony, *Libellus*, p. 45, no. 39: "... ad libros atque ad sustentationem necessariis ..."

110. *Constitutiones antiquae*, Dist. 2, cap. 29: "Circa eos qui student, taliter dispensetur a prelato, ne propter officium vel aliud de facili a studio retrahantur vel impediuntur."

111. Thomas, *De oudste Constituties*, 317: "...hore omnes in ecclesia breviter et succincte taliter dicantur, ne fratres devotionem amittant et eorum studium minime impediatur."

112. *Constitutiones antiquae*, Dist. I. cap. 21, 332: "...si in studio ad lectiones dormierit; si libros interdictos legerit; si legentes vel audientes inquietaverit; si in predicationem vadens otiosa locutus fuerit vel egerit; si dissolute ridens, cachinnis vel ludis, dictis vel factis, alios ad ridendum concitare intenderit; si ad Gloria primi psalmi non affuerit et ad gradus altaris non satisfecerit. Pro singulis harum culparum iniungatur pro pena petenti veniam unus psalmus."

113. *Ibid.*, Dist. 1, cap. 21, 333. "... quod gravius est, in usu habuerit; si quis eorum, qui officiis suis

deputati sunt, in aliquo circa officium suum negligens repertus fuerit,..., magistri in docendo, studentes in studendo, scriptores in scribendo, ..."

114. *Ibid.*, Dist. II, cap. 23, p. 358 and Dist. II, cap. 29, p. 362.

115. *Acta*, 1, 1235, 5: "Admonemus quod fratres diligenter instruantur in officio audiendarum confessionum antequam fiant auditores earum."

116. *Ibid.*, 1, 1236, 9: "Admonemus priores ut servant diligenter constitutionem de predicatoribus mittendis, examinandis et instruendis."

117. Raymond Creyten, "L'instruction des novices dominicains au XIII^e siècle d'après le ms. Toulouse 418," *AFP* 20 (1950): 114–193.

118. *Acta I*, 1305, 12: "Nullus ad studium logicale mittatur, nisi saltem in ordine bene et religiose duobus annis fuerit conversatus vel alias in seculor fuerit etate proventus et in logicalibus instructus. ..."

119. See *Actaprov. Prov.*, 1301, 139, novices not adequately prepared were ordered "ad domos proprias remittantur. ..."

120. *Ibid.*, 1267, 126. "...nullus prior recipiat aliquem ad Ordinem infra annum xv^{um} completum nec aliquem quem oportet in grammaticalibus instrui. ..."

121. *Ibid.*, 1261, 84. "Item, rogamus priores quod faciant instrui iuvenes dociles in grammaticalibus et in logica veteri, cum nos nullum de huiusmodi studium ordinemus,"

122. Thomas Kaeppli, "Acta capitulorum Provinciae Hispaniae a. 1390–93 celebratorum," *AFP* 38 (1968): 21–99, esp. 24–25.

123. Henri M. Féret, "Vie intellectuelle et vie scolaire dans l'Ordre de Prêcheurs," *Archives d'histoire dominicaine* 1 (1946), 12.

124. Thomas, *De oudste Constituties*, Dist. 2, cap. 28, p. 361: "Quoniam circa studentes diligens est adhibenda cautela, aliquem fratrem specialem habeant, sine cuius licentia non scribant quaternos nec audiant lectiones. Et que circa eos in studio corrigenda viderit, corrigat et, si vires excedant, prelo proponat."

125. Only the sick and infirm were excused from all school activities. Friars who were enrolled in the *studia theologiae* were excused from attending priory school classes but not from participating in the exercises. M.-M. Mulcahey, "Dominican education and the Dominican ministry in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: Fra Jacop Passavanti and the Florentine convent of San Maria Novella," (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1989): 2, 269.

126. Mulcahey, *Provincial Houses*, 135–170

127. Mulcahey, "Dominican Education," 1, 160.

128. For a discussion of the *collatio* as practiced in the medieval monastic houses, see Jean Leclercq, *The love of learning and the desire for God: a study of monastic culture* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1982), 167.

129. Mulcahey, "Dominican Education," 185–194.

130. *Acta*, 2, 63–64: "Cum ordo noster propter salutem animarum specialiter sit fundatus, ad quam procurandum oportet habere noticiam de scripturis, volumus et ordinamus, quod studentes in omni facultate teneantur continue sequi scholas, disputationes, collaciones in .vi. Feriis et repeticiones, quas volumus fieri secundum ordinationem capituli lanuensis. Ante prandium quoque, quando lectores non legunt, in studio vel collacione scientifica se occupent, quantum possint. ..."

131. *Ibid.*, 1, 1259, 99. "... privatas lectiones, vel hystorias, vel summam de casibus, vel aliquod huiusmodi, ne fratres sint ociosi."

132. Humbert of Romans, *Instructiones*, 257–259.

133. Edward Brett, "The Dominican library in the thirteenth century," *Journal of Library History* 15 (1980): 303–308; Paul Amargier, "Le livre chez les prêcheurs dans la province de Provence au XIII^e siècle," in *Enseignement et vie intellectuelle (XV^e–XVI^e siècle*, actes au du 95 Congrès National des Sociétés Savantes, Reims, 1970, Section de philologie et d'histoire jusqu'à 1610 (Paris: Bibliothèque National, 1975), 1: 405–407; Gabriela Severino Polica, "Libro, Lettura, <<Lezione>> negli Studia degli Ordini Mendicanti (Sec. XIII)," in *Le scuole degli ordini mendicanti* (Todi: Presso L'Accademia Tudertina, 1978): 373–414; C. Douais, "Assignations des livres aux religieux du convent des Frères Prêcheurs de Barcelona (XIII^e–XIV^e siècles)," *Revue des bibliothèques* 3 (1893): 49–83; F. Pelster, "Die Bibliothek von Santa Caterina zu Pisa, eine Büchersammlung aus den Zeiten des hl. Thomas von Aquin," *Xenia Thomistica* 3 (1925): 249–280; and Thomas Kaeppli, *Inventari di libri di San Domenico de Perugia (1430–1480)*, Sussedi eruditi, 15 (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1962) and "Antiche biblioteche domenicane in Italia," *AFP* 36 (1966): 5–80; Luciano Gargan, *Lo Studio teologico e la Biblioteca dei Domenicani a Padova nel Tre e Quattrocento* (Padova: Anetore, 1971). For comparative information regarding Franciscan libraries, see Raoul Manselli, "Due biblioteche di <<Studia>> Minoritici: Santa Croce di Firenze e il Santo di Padova," in *Le Scuole degli Ordini Mendicanti*, 353–372 and C. Cenci, "Biblioteche e Bibliofili

134. *Acta*, 2, 1310, 50: “Rogamus magistrum ordinis, quod ipse de tribus studiis, scilicet ebraico, greco et arabico provideat in aliquibus provinciis; et cum fuerint ordinata, ad quodlibet illorum quolibet provincia studentem aptum et intelligentem mittere possit cum contributione decenti. ...” and *Acta* 2, 1332, 220: “... ordinantes, quod vicarius magistri ordinis super fratres, qui mittuntur ad gentes, in locis et conventibus de Pera et Capha instituat fratres, quos ad hoc habuerit magis ydoneos, qui de linguis et ydiomatibus fratres illuc missos instruere et informare valeant competenter. ...” Provincial *acta* provide more specific information regarding one *studium arabicum* dating from 1250, one *studium ebraicum* at Barcellona and one ‘*arabicum*’ at Valencia in 1281. See *Spanish Prov Chap.*, 1250, 612; 1257, 617; and 1281, 625–626.

135. Evidence concerning the Dominican *studium Bibliae* can be found in general and provincial capitular *acta* dating from 1290 to 1340. *Ibid.*, 2, 1308, 34: “Cum studium sacre scripture nimis notabiliter sit collapsum et a plerisque negligi videatur, ... Distincte iungit, quod in singulis provinciis conventus aliquis seu aliqui statuatur, in quibus sola biblia legatur biblice, et ad illud studium fratres ydonei deputentur.” *Studium Bibliae* first appear in the capitular *acta* of Provence in 1290. *Acta prov. Prov.*, 1290, 333.

136. It should be noted that provincial schools, especially the *studium artium*, were not a fixed feature of the Dominican school system until 1259 when the constitutional prohibition against the study of arts was removed. See *Acta*, 1, 99–100. In addition, there was much regional variation in regard to the provincial schools. See Paul Armargier, et al., “Panorama geografico, cronologico e statistico sulla distribuzione degli Studia degli ordini mendicanti,” in *Le scuole degli ordini mendicanti* (Todi: Presso L’Accademia, 1978): 35–150; Fritz Burner, “Studentenverzeichnisse der Dominikanerprovinz Saxonien, ca. 1277,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 44 (1925): 490–504; and Isnard Frank, “Zur Studienorganisation der Dominikanerprovinz Teutonia in der ersten Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts; und zum studiengang des Seiligen Heinrich Seuse, O.P.,” in *Heinrich Seuse; Studien zum 600 Todestag* (1966): 39–69.

137. Mulchahey, “Dominican *Studium* System,” 318; and Hinnebusch, *History*, 2, 26–27.

138. *Acta*, 2, 1305, 12 and 2, 1325, 158.

139. Mulchahey, “Dominican Houses,” 126.

140. *ibid.*, 234.

141. Olga Weijers, *Terminologie des universités au XIII^e siècle, Lessico Intellettuale Europeo*, 29 (Rome: Edizioni dell’Ateneo, 1987): 35.

142. *Ibid.*, 40; Douais, *Essai*, 125.

143. *Acta*, 1, 1297, 286: “Committimus magistro ordinis ordinationem studii Parisiensis et aliorum studiorum generalium ut ipse de magistris et bacallariis provideat ordinet et disponat prout utilitati ordinis et profectui viderit expedire.” See also *Acta*, 1, 1303, 325.

144. General chapters restructured the quota system in 1301, 1303, 1315, 1316, and 1326. See Hinnebusch, *History*, 2, 44–45.

145. That the Dominicans, themselves, differentiated between their own *studia generalia* and those which comprised the universities, is illustrated by the clause contained in *Acta*, 2, 1306, 17: “Ordinamus et volumus, quod nullus lector sine licencia magistri vel prioris vel eius vicarii aut diffinitorum de quolibet audeat disputare, nisi ubi fratrum vel secularium viget studium generale.” See Mulchahey, *First the bow*, 316 for further discussion.

146. *Acta*, 1, 1273, 169: “Admonemus, quod priores provinciales vel eorum vicarii non mittant ad studia fratres discipulos vel ineptos et si quos tales miserint sine dilacione studeant revocare.”

147. *Ibid.*, 1, 1251, 59: “Monemus quod tales mittantur ad loca pro generali studio deputata qui sint maturi in moribus et habiles ad studendum.”

148. *Ibid.*, 1, 1287, 241: “Rogamus magistrum ordinis ut quam cito poterit Parisius aliquam fratrem vel alioquos qui auctoritate sua inquirant de quibusdam studentibus nec non et aliis qui dicuntur nuper turbacionem fecisse in conventu Parisiensi et secundum quod invenerint acrius puniant turbatores et si eis visum fuerit pro pace dicti conventus possint studentes extraneos ad suas provincias remittere ac etiam alios mutare et emittere de conventu et a suis officiis absolvere.”

149. See, for instance, *Ibid.*, 1, 1282, 218–219.

150. *Ibid.*, 1, 1302, 315: “Districte inhiibemus ne studentes in generalibus studiis se occupetut in beguinaris aut familiaritatibus notabilibus mulierum sed intendant studio ad quod sunt per suas provincias deputati mandantes iniungentes prioribus et subprioribus universis necnon vicariis conventuum eorumdem quod discurrendi vel declinandi ad loca huiusmodi cenciam non concedant facientes contrarium severius puniendo.”

151. Lawrence, *The Friars*, 167.

152. *Acta*, 1, 1246, 36 and 1, 1283, 225.

153. Raymond Creytens, "Le Studium Romanae Curiae" et le Maître du Sacre Palais," *AFP* 12 (1942): 5–83, esp. 32–53.

154. See Hinnebusch, *History*, 2, 43–44.

155. Creytens, "Le Studium Romanae Curiae," 69.

156. Joseph Koch, "Durandus de S. Porciano, OP," *BGPMA* 26, 1, (1927): 402–406.

157. Thomae Kaeppli, "Le process contre Thomas Waleys, OP," (Rome 1936), 29; and Creytens, "Le Studium Romanae Curiae," 68–75.

158. Paul Armagier, et. al., "Panorama geografico, cronologico e statistico sulla distribuzione degli Studia degli ordini mendicanti," in *Le scuole degli ordini mendicanti*, 35–150.

159. Bedouelle, *St. Dominic*, 167.

160. *Acta provinciae Romanae* (Pisa, 1276), 47: "Volumus quod omnes studentes a conventibus unde traxerunt originem induantur et studentes in theologia teneantur ire ad chorum in Prima, missa et ad completorium et ad matutinum in festis ix lectionum et supra, studentes vero in logica teneantur ira ad omnes horas sicut ceteri fratres. ..."

161. See, for instance, *Acta*, 1, 1301, 306: "Districte iniungimus et ordinamus inviolabiliter observari quod in presentacione bacallariorum et eorum expedicione ille ordo servetur qui hactenus est servatus ita quod posterior in lectura sentenciarum nullatenus preponatur nec licenciam aut recipere vel recepta uti valeat nisi magistro vel eo mortuo vel amoto ipsius magistri vicario ex causis racionalibus aliter videretur."

162. *Monumenta*, Koudelka: 157–8.

163. *BOP*, 1, 164.

164. The significance of the Dominicans' initial entrance into ecclesiastical education is dealt with in Pierre Mandonnet's, "La crises scolaire aud debut du siècle et la fondation de l'ordre des freres Precheurs," in *Dominique*, 2, ed. M-H. Vicaire and P. Mandonnet, 83–199.

165. See, for example, Angelus Walz, "Des Aage von Danemark 'Rotulus pugillorum,'" *Classica et medaevalia* 16 (1955), 136.

166. The *Ratio Studiorum* was a list of recommendations drawn up by Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Peter of Tarentaise, Florence of Hesdin and Bonhomme of Brittany. See *CUP*, 1, 385. It was first officially adopted by the General Chapter of 1259 and ratified by the following two general chapters. For background discussions of the evolution of the *Ratio Studiorum*, see James Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino*, 138–139 and Hinnebusch, *History*, 2, 7–8. Most of the reforms dealt with the selection and supervision of students and lectors. The *Ratio studiorum* is contained in *Acta*, 1, 99–100 and *CUP*, 1, 385–386.

167. Gerard of Frachet, *Vitae fratrum ordnis Praedicatorum*, 128: "... honeste vivere, discere et docere."

168. *ST II.II.q.182. a.2.*

169. Thomas' *principium* lecture was based on the text, "Rigans montes de superioribus suis." See James Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino*, 373–374. *De Veritate*, q. 11.

170. Mulcahey, "Dominican Studium," 296.

171. *Monumenta*, Koudelka, no. 161 and *CUP*, 1, no. 44.

172. Mulcahey, "Dominican Studium," 296.

173. Rashdall, *Universities*, 1, 370.

174. *Monumenta*, no. 161, 2nd *CUP*, 1, no. 44.

175. *Acta*, 1, 34, 38, and 41.

176. *Ibid.*, I, 1259, 99: "Quod fratres qui remanent a scholis dure puniantur."

177. Alan Cobban, *The medieval universities: their development and organization* (London: Methuen & Co., 1975), 91.

178. M.-M. Dufeil, *Guillaume de Saint-Amour et la Polémique Universitaire Parisienne, 1250–1259* (Paris: Picard, 1972). The chronology of the events which comprised the secular-mendicant disputes is contained in Palemon Glorieux, "Le conflit de 1252–1257 à la lumière du mémoire de Guillaume de Saint-Amour," *RTAM* 24 (1957): 364–372.

179. *CUP*, 1, no. 240, 267–270.

180. *Ibid.*, 1, no. 298, 346–347.

181. *Ibid.*, 1, no. 282, 324.

182. John Murphy, "The Early Franciscan Studium at the University of Paris," in *Studium Generale: Studies offered to Astrik L. Gabriel*, Texts and studies in the history of medieval education, no. 11 (Notre Dame: Medieval Institute, 1967), 196.

183. The Dominicans even got the worst of it in contemporary anti-mendicant songs and poems, as is evidenced by the vitriolic tone of Rutebeuf's *La descorde de l'Université et des Jacobins*. See Edward B. Ham, *Rutebeuf and Louis IX*, University of North Carolina studies in the Romance Languages and

Literature, 42 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962), 22.

184. *CUP*, 1,300–313.

185. *Acta*, 1, 1239, 11: “Ut fratres nostri diligenter admoneat populum ut ecclesias et prelatos eorum honorent et eis fideliter reddant iura sua, et quod temporibus suis ecclesias suas parrochiales frequentent.”

186. *Ibid.*, 1, 1239, 11: “Adonemus ne fratres nostri vadant ad domos secularium vel clericorum pro fratribus nec recipiant cum scandalo evidenti.”

187. *Ibid.*, I, 1252, 63: “Caveant fratres ubique ne prelatibus vel clericis dent materiam turbacionis vel scandali sed potius eos habeat in reverencia et honore et inducant populum sicut commode poterunt ad devocionem erga eos et ut iura sua reddant eis fideliter nec contendant cum eis de potestate quam habemus in confessionibus audiendis et predicacione vel huiusmodi.”

188. *Ibid.*, I, 1254, 69: “In eodem capitulo in fine addatur sic nulla scripta facta vel compilata a fratribus nostris aliquatenus publicenter nisi primum per fratres peritos quibus magister vel prior provincialis commiserit diligenter fuerint examinata.”

189. *Ibid.*, 1256, 80–81: “Iniungimus omnibus fratribus sicut eciam olim iuniunctum fuit. Quod articulos condemnatos per episcopum et magistros Parisienses deleant de scriptis suis in quibuscumque fuerint et eciam quod priores provinciales vel socii eorum transcripta eorum portent ad provincias suas. Quicumque eciam fratrum aliquid erroneum secundum conscienciam suam in libris vel scriptis alicuius fratris invenerit mittat illud scriptum magistro ordinis.”

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

1. The earliest attempt within modern historiography to render the medieval Dominicans unique in their theological orientation occurred in 1895, when Hastings Rashdall penned his portrayal of “the sternly orthodox, authority-loving, persecuting Dominicans.” Rashdall, *Universities*, 3, 215.

2. Since 1920, at least two scholars have argued that the Dominican Order was somehow predisposed to adopt some form of Aristotelianism. First, in 1938, G. Théry stated that Aquinas’ teachings were formed, to a large extent, by a specifically Dominican spirituality. See G. Théry, “Caractères généraux de la spiritualité dominicaine,” *La Vie spirituelle* 54 (1938), Supplément, 23–24. Two decades after the publication of Théry’s article, David Knowles suggested that Dominican governmental structures predisposed the Order towards the adoption of some form of Aristotelianism. See Knowles, *Religious Orders*, 3, 159.

3. For instance, Raymond Martin argued that, prior to the Condemnations of 1277, there was no discernable set of doctrines or beliefs specific to the Dominicans. Raymond Martin, “Quelque ‘premiers’ maîtres dominicains de Paris et d’Oxford et la soidisant école dominicaine augustinienne (1229–1279),” *RSPT* 9 (1920): 556–580.

4. Mulchahey, “First the bow,” 55–56.

5. Simon Tugwell, “De Huiusmodi Sermonibus Textur Omnis recta Predicatio: changing attitudes towards the Word of God,” in *De l’Homélie au sermon. Histoire de la prédication médiévale* (Louvain-la-Neuve: Université catholique de Louvain, 1993), 167.

6. Both “scholastic” and “scholasticism” are etymologically derived from the Latin noun *schola*, which originally meant a learned conversation or discussion but came to be understood as denoting simply a place of study or learning. See C. D. DuCange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, 6 vols. (Paris: Firmin Didot fratres, 1846), 6: 109–111. For treatments of the evolution of the teaching and evolution of theology within the contexts of the monasteries and the cathedral schools, see Marie-Dominique Chenu, *La théologie au XII^e siècle* (Paris: Vrin, 1957); and H. Donneau, “M.-D. Chenu et La Théologie comme science au XIII^e siècle,” *Mémoire dominicaine* 4 (1994): 139–175; J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XII^e siècle* (Bruges: Éditions “De Tempel”, 1948); and G. Paré, A. Brunet, P. Tremblay, *La Renaissance du XII^e siècle: les Ecoles et l’enseignement* (Paris: Vrin, 1933). For scholasticism within the universities, see Jorge J. E. Garcia, “Scholasticism and Scholastic Method,” *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, 13 vols. (New York: Scribner) 10: 56 and P. Glorieux, “L’enseignement au moyen âge. Techniques et méthodes en usage à la Faculté de Théologie de Paris, au XIII^e siècle,” *AHDLMA* 35 (1968): 65–186.

7. Beryl Smalley, “Ecclesiastical attitudes to novelty, c. 1100–1250,” in *Church, society and politics*, ed. Derek Baker, *Studies in Church history*, 12 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1975), 126.

8. See G. R. Evans, *The language and logic of the Bible: The earlier Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), especially the section entitled, “*Lectio, disputatio, predictio*,” 8–13 and Ludwig Hodl, “*Quaestio, Quaestioneliteratur*,” *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 8, 925–928.

9. Chenu, *Towards Understanding*, 81.

10. James Weisheipl, “Evolution of the scholastic method,” in *The logic of science*, Philosophical series

4, ed. Vincent E. Smith (New York: St. John's University Press, 1964), 74 and G. R. Evans, "Theology: the vocabulary of teaching and research, 1300–1600: words and concepts," in *Vocabulary of teaching and research between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. Olga Weijers, Études sur le vocabulaire intellectuel du Moyen Âge 7 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1995): 118–133, esp., 125.

11. Olga Weijers, *Terminologie des universités au XIII^e siècle*, Lessico Intellettuale Europeo, 39 (Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1987): 347–355. Weijers' work has been reviewed by Teja Ebb in *Mittelalterliches Jahrbuch*, Bd. 29. 2 (1994): 144–148.

12. Stephen Brown, "Key terms in medieval theological vocabulary," in *Méthodes et instruments du travail intellectuel au moyen âge: études sur le vocabulaire*, ed. Olga Weijers, Études sur le Vocabulaire Intellectuel du Moyen Âge 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1990), 85.

13. Weishiepl, "Evolution of the scientific method," 75. The origins of the disputation are discussed in Anthony Kenny and Jan Pinbourg, "Medieval philosophical literature," in *Cambridge history of later medieval philosophy: from the rediscovery of Aristotle to the disintegration of scholasticism, 1100–1600*, ed. Norman Kretzmann, et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982): 24–26. See also Brian Lawn, *Rise and decline of the scholastic Quaestio disputata: with special emphasis on its use in the teaching of medicine and science*, Education and society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1993).

14. Rainer Christoph Schwinges, "Student education, student life," in *Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. Hilde de Ridder Symoens, A history of the university in Europe, ed. Walter Riiegg, 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 232.

15. B. Bazan, "La *quaestio disputata*," in *Les genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales: Définition, critique, et exploitation*, ed. B. Bazan, Actes du Colloque international de Louvain-la-Neuve, 24–27 Mai, 1981 (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982): 31–50. See also W. J. Courtenay "Programs of study and genres of scholastic theological production in the fourteenth century," in *Manuels, programmes de Cours et Techniques d'Enseignement dans les Universités Médiévales*, ed. Jacqueline Hamesse (Louvain-la-Neuve: Publications de l'Institut d'Études Médiévales, 1994): 325–350.

16. L. Bianchi and E. Randi, "Le difficoltà di reportare," in *Filosofi e teologi: la ricerca e l'insegnamento nell'università medievale*, a cura di L. Bianchi, E. Randi (Bergamo: Lubrina, 1989): 53–54.

17. Articles were yet another form of the *quaestio*. See Chenu, *Toward understanding*, 86–93.

18. The most complete treatment of florilegia that I know of is M. A. and R. H. Rouse, *Authentic witnesses: approaches to medieval texts and manuscripts*, Publications in medieval studies, 17 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991): 101–258. See also the successive three articles: B. Munk Olsen, "Les florilèges d'auteurs classiques,"; M. A. and R. H. Rouse, "Floregia of Patristic Texts,"; and J. Hamesse, "Les florilèges philosophiques du XIII^e au XV^e siècle," in *Les genres littéraires*: 151–192.

19. John Wippel, "Quodlibetal questions, chiefly in theology faculties," in *Les Questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les facultés de théologies, de droit et de médecine* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1985): 153–224; idem., "Quodlibetal questions as a distinctive literary genre," in *Les genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales: Définition, critique, et exploitation*, Actes du Colloque international de Louvain-la-Neuve, 25–27 Mai, 1981 (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982): 67–84.

20. Louis J. Bataillon, "Early scholastic mendicant preaching," 165–198 and Leonard Boyle, "Summae confessorum," in *Les genres littéraires*: 227–238.

21. G. R. Evans, "Theology: the vocabulary," 121.

22. For a treatment of the concept of theology during the early Middle Ages, see Guilio d'Onofrio, "Theological ideas and the idea of theology in the early Middle Ages," *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 38 (1991): 296–297.

23. P. C. Spicq, *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge*, Bibliothèque thomiste 26 (Paris: Vrin, 1944).

24. Beryl Smalley, *The study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964): 49–77.

25. A. M. Landgraf, *Introduction à l'histoire de la littérature théologique de la scolastique naissante* (Montreal: Paris: Institut d'études médiévales, 1973): 49–77.

26. Monika Asztalos, "The faculty of theology," in *Universities of the Middle Ages*: 409–441, esp. 411.

27. G. R. Evans, "Theology: the vocabulary," 120.

28. Stephen Marrone, "Speculative theology in the late thirteenth century and the way to beatitude," in *Les philosophies morales et politiques au Moyen Âge*, 2, 1067–1068 and G. R. Evans, "Theology: the vocabulary," 121. There has been a growing interest in professional aspect of the vocation of medieval theologians. See, for instance, William Courtenay, *Teaching careers at the University of Paris in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries*, Texts and studies in the history of medieval education, no. 12 (Notre Dame: U.S. Subcommission for the History of Universities, 1988). For theologians at Oxford, see Jeremy

Catto, "Theology and theologians 1220–1320," in *The early Oxford schools*, The history of the University of Oxford 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984): 471–518.

29. In reality, other expectations were placed upon theologians, by others and by themselves. See Ian Wei, "The self-image of the masters of theology at the University of Paris in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries," *JEH* 46 (1995): 398–431; Astrik Gabriel, "The ideal master of the medieval university," *CHR* 9 (1974): 1–40; Jean Leclercq, "L'idéal du théologien au moyen âge: textes inédites," *Revue des sciences religieuses* 26 (1947): 121–148 and Katherine Walsh, "The later medieval schoolman in theory and practice," *IhS* 2 (1979): 171–176.

30. For further elaboration, see L. J. Batillon, "Les conditions de travail des maîtres de l'Université de Paris au XIII^e siècle," *RSPT* 67 (1983): 417–33.

31. Ian P. Wei, "The Masters of Theology at the University of Paris in the late thirteenth century: an authority beyond the schools," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 75 (1993): 37–63.

32. Jacques Verger, "Teachers," in *Universities in the Middle Ages*: 161–168.

33. G. R. Evans, "Exegesis and authority in the thirteenth century," in *Ad litteram*: 93–112, esp. 93.

34. See Pablo Nardi, "Relations with authority," in *Universities in the Middle Ages*, 77–107; Mary McLaughlin, "Paris masters of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and ideas of intellectual freedom," *Church History* 24/3 (1995): 195–211 and Guy Fitch Lytle, "Universities as religious authorities in the later Middle Ages and Reformation," in *Reform and authority in the medieval and Reformation Church*, ed. Guy Fitch Lytle (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1981): 69–81. For an analysis of the development of papal control of theological activity, see Yves Cōngar, "Pour une histoire sémantique du terme 'magisterium'," *RSPT* 60 (1976): 88–98.

35. Marcia Colish, "Teaching and learning theology in medieval Paris," in *Schools of thought in the Christian tradition*, ed. Patrick Henry (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984): 106–124, esp. 113.

36. Chenu, *Towards understanding*, 136.

37. Gilson, *History of Christian philosophy in the Middle Ages* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1955), 417.

38. Mary McLaughlin, *Intellectual freedom and its limitations in the University of Paris in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries* (New York: Arno Press, 1977), 172.

39. David Burr, "Olivi and the limits of intellectual freedom," in *Contemporary reflections on the medieval Christian tradition: essays in honor of Ray C. Petry*, ed. George H. Shriver (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1974), 190 and 195–196.

40. Louis-Jacques Bataillon, "L'activité intellectuelle des dominicains de la première génération," in *Lector et compiler: Vincent de Beauvais, frère prêcheur un intellectuel et son milieu au XIII^e siècle* (Grâne, France: CNRS, 1997), 14. See also Raymond Creytens, "'Le studium Romanae Curiae' et le Maître du Sacre Palais," *AFP* 12 (1942): 5–83.

41. M. Mulchahey, "The Dominican *Studium* system and the universities of Europe in the thirteenth century," in *Manuels, programmes*: 277–324.

42. These were Etienne de Venizy (Frater Stephen) in 1241 and Peter of Tarentaise (Later Innocent V) between 1264 and 1267. For the former, see *CUP*, 1, 170, no. 128; and the discussion in Jacques Bougerol, "A propos des condamnations parisiennes de 1241 et 1244," *AFH* 80 (1987): 462–466.

43. Chenu, *Towards understanding*, 289.

44. Robert J. Schneider, "Introduction," in *Vincentii Belvacensis: De Morali Principis Institutione*, CC - CM, 137 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1995), xxii.

45. R. H. and M. A. Rouse, "The Verbal Concordance to the Scriptures," *AFP* 44 (1974), 5–30.

46. *Acta*, 1, 1236, 9: "Volumus et mandamus ut secundum correctionem quam faciunt fratres quibus his iniungitur in provinciae [Francie]. Bible alie ordinis corrigantur et punctentur."

47. Burkhard Hasebrink, "Studies on redaction and use of the *Paradisus anime intelligentis*," in *De L'Homélie au sermon. Histoire de la prédication médiévale* (Louvain-la-Neuve: U. of Catholique de Louvain, 1993), 141.

48. *Acta*, 1, 1233, 4: "Volumus et mandamus. Ut libri fratrum decedensium, et maxime bible, extra nec intra ordinem vendantur. Sed pocius fratribus provicientibus concedantur."

49. Vincent Ferrua, "I fratri predicatori a Torino. Dall'insediamento a tutto il secolo XIV," *Bollettino storico-bibliografico subalpino* 90 (1992): 111–165.

50. Franz Pelster, "Die Bibliothek von Santa Caterina zu Pisa, eine Büchersammlung aus den Zeiten des hl. Thomas von Aquin," *Xenia Thomistica* 3 (1925): 249–280.

51. Bataillon, "L'activité intellectuelle," in *Lector et compiler*, 16.

52. Alain Nadeau, "Faire œuvre utile. Notes sur le vocabulaire de quelques prologues dominicains du XIII^e siècle," in *Lector et compiler*: 77–96.

53. Simon Tugwell, "Humbert of Romans, 'Compiler,'" in *Lector et compiler*, 55. See also Humbert

of Romans, *Regulations for the operation of a medieval library* (St. Paul, MN: Associates of the James Ford Bell Library, University of Minnesota, 1980); previously published in *The Library*, 33 (1978): 47–50.

54. This was actually a long-term project. The first attempt was initiated by the Chapter of Bologna in 1244; the goal was not actually achieved until 1254–1256. See Hinnebusch, *History*, 2, 19–32 for discussion.

55. These canonical prohibitions are found in Gratian's *Decretum*, among other places. See Alfonso Maierù, *University training in medieval Europe*, Education and society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 5. See also G. G. Meersseman, "In libris gentiliū non studeant." *L'étude des classiques interdite aux clercs au moyen âge?* *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 11 (1958): 1–13.

56. But, it should be noted, the prohibitions legislated at Paris did not prevent secular theologians from studying Aristotle for their own personal edification. *CUP*, 1, 70, n. 11; 2, 78–79, n. 20. See S. Ferruolo, "The Statutes of 1215 reconsidered," *History of the universities* 5 (1985): 1–85.

57. *Constitutiones antiquae*, 240: "In libris Gentiliū et Philosophorum non studeant, et si ad horam inspiciant, b. Saeculares sententias non addiscant, neque artes quas liberales vocant, nisi aliquando circa aliquos Magister Ordinis, vel Capitulum Generale vel Prior provincialis, vel Capitulum provinciale, voluerit aliter dispensare. ..."

58. Mulcahey, *First the bow*, 97.

59. See L. Robles, "El estudio de las artes liberales en la primitiva legislación dominicana. Antecedentes históricos," *Artes libérales et Philosophie au moyen âge*, Actes du quatrième Congrès international de Philosophie médiévale (Montreal: University of Montreal, 1969): 599–616.

60. Mulcahey, *First the bow*, 60.

61. *Ibid.*, 224.

62. *Acta prov. Rom.*, 1243, 1: "Fr. Bonifacio Senensis iniungimus ut omnes libros ut rationes quae habet de philosophia tradat priori suo et amodo in hiis studeat, nisi forte, correptione eius exigente, cum eo per priorem suum fuerit dispensatum."

63. *Ibid.*, 1244, 2: "Quicumque, preter lectores, habet aliquos tractatus sive libros pertinentes ad aliquas scientias seculare, preter tractatus logicales et ea que pertinent ad moralem philosophiam, resignet priori suo infra vii dies postquam hoc mandatum scriberit; nec de cetero talia aliquis habeat, nec ista eis reddantur, nisi fieret de licentia speciali provincialis, sine cuius licentia aliquis de cetero talia non legat nec audiat, nisi secundum formam constitutionum."

64. For background discussions of the evolution of the *Ratio studiorum*, see James Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1974): 138–139; Hinnebusch, *History*, 2, 7–8; and Tugwell, "Albert: introduction," in *Albert & Thomas*, 15.

65. Brett, *Humbert of Romans*, 49.

66. *CUP*, 1, 385: "Apud Valencenas anno Dominic MCCLIX de mandato magistri et diffinitorum pro promotione studii ordinatum est per fratres Bonumhominem, Forentium, Albertum Theutonicum, Thomam de Aquino, Petrum de Tharantasia, magistros theologiae Parisius, qui interfuerunt dicto Capitulo, quod lectores non occupentur in factis vel negotiis, per que a lectionibus retrahantur." The names of the committee members were originally derived from the acta of the Provincial Chapter of Beziers of 1261. See *Acta prov. Prov.*, 88.

67. *Ibid.*, 1, 386: "Item provideatur quod quilibet lector tenens aliquod studium solempne, habeat bacellarium, qui legat sub eo. ... Item, quod in quolibet conventu, ubi est lector, instituatur aliquis frater qui diligenter repetat, dummodo sit in conventu aliquis sufficiens. ... Item, quod fiant repetitiones de questionibus et collationes de questionibus semel in septimana, ubi hoc commode poterit observari."

68. *Ibid.*: "Item, quod ordinetur in provinciis, qui ingiuerint, aliquod studium artium vel aliqua, ubi iuvenes instruantur."

69. The prescribed textbooks as itemized in *CUP*, 1, no. 277–278 are: "Veterim logicam, videlicet librum Porfirii, ... divisionum et thopicorum Beocii ... Priscianum minorem et maiorem, topica et elenchos, priora et posteriora ... Ethicas ... Physicam Aristotelis, metaphisicam et librum de animalibus ..." See M. Colish, "Teaching and learning," 113 for a discussion of these curricular changes.

70. *Acta*, I, 129.

71. *Ibid.*, I, 109: "Iniungimus prioribus provincialibus et diffinitoribus provinciarum Hispanie. Romane. provincie. Theutonie. Polonie. Ungarie. Dacie. Quod ordinet. Quod fratres iuniores et docibiles in logicalibus instruantur. In provincia vero Theutonie instituant duo vel tria studia huiusmodi in conventibus ydoneis ad praedicta."

72. Douais, *Acta*, 139 (1269).

73. *Acta prov. Rom.*, 1288: 85–88.

74. M.M. Davy, *Les sermons universitaires Parisiens de 1230–1231*, Études de Philosophie médiévale (Paris: Vrin, 1931): 85; 292.

76. Apollonia Koperska, *Die Stellung der religiösen Orden zu den Profanwissenschaften im 12 und 13 Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg: Kommissionsverlag der Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1914): 122–124.

77. Douais, *Essai sur l'organisation*, 54.

78. For anecdotal evidence, see Roland's quip, cited in A. Dondaine, "Un commentaire scripturaire de Roland de Cremona, 'Le Livre de Job,'" *AFPXI* (1941), 116: "Loyci audiunt predicatorem et intrant religionem. ... Unde enim implentur claustra, nisi de dialectis et sophisticis?"

79. Weisheipl, "Friar Thomas," 13–20; 49–91.

80. Humbert of Romans, for instance, argued that philosophy was justifiable among the brethren to the extent that it helped to defend the faith and destroy error. *Expositio Regulae* cited in Maierü, *University Training in Medieval Europe*, 5, ff. 21. "Valent ergo Philosophiae scientiae ad fidei defensionem, ad errorum destructionem, ad sanctorum Scripturarum intellectionem, ad ingenii acutionem, ad fidei adiutorium, ad cordium commotionem, ad evitandum Ordinis contemptum, ad scientiarum illarum contemptum. Proinde non sunt omnino contemnendae."

81. • J. Verger, "L'histoire des institutions scolaires et les études de philosophie médiévale," in *Gli studi di filosofia medievale fra Otto e Novecento. Contributo a un bilancio storiografico*, ed. R. Imbach and A. Maierü (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1991): 361–375.

82. In his *De instructione officialium*, Humbert of Romans mandated that every Dominican convent should maintain a silent reading room. See Humbert of Romans, *Opera de vita regulari*, ed. J.J. Berthier, 1, 421. The Dominicans were among the first to embrace silent reading. Intriguingly, they were the first to implement the practice as a policy within their libraries. For discussion, see Paul Henry Saenger, *Space between words: the origins of silent reading* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1977): 262–263.

83. R. James Long has speculated that Fishacre's teaching on free choice may have had a tentative relationship to the "beginnings of a specifically Dominican philosophical tradition." See R. James Long, "Richard Fishacre's Treatise *De Libero Arbitrio*," in *Les philosophies morales et politiques au Moyen Âge*, 2, 885. See also Beryl Smalley, "Robert Bacon and the early Dominican school at Oxford," *TRHS*, 4th ser., 30 (1948): 1–19 and Ephrem Filthaut, *Roland von Cremona O.P. und die Anfänge der Scholastik im Predigerorden* (Albertus-Magnus-Verlad, 1936).

84. Knowles, *Evolution*, 250.

85. Simon Tugwell, "Introduction," *Early Dominicans: selected writings*, Classics of western spirituality (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), 25.

86. Albert the Great, *Alberti Magni Physica, pars I (Libri 1–4)*, ed. P. Hossifeld (*Opera omnia*, ed. Coloniensis 4 pars 1, 1987): 1.1. 1., 1: "Intentio nostra in scientia naturali est satisfacere pro nostra possibilitate fratribus ordinis nostri nos rogantibus ex pluribus iam praecedentibus annis, ut talens librum de physicis eis componeremus, in quo et scientiam naturalem perfectam haberent et ex quo libros Aristotelis competenter intelligere possent."

87. James Weisheipl, "Albertus Magnus and the Oxford Platonists," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* (1958), 126.

88. Yves Congar, "In dulcedine societatis quaerere veritatem" - Notes sur le travail en équipe chez les Prêcheurs au XIII^e siècle," in *Albertus Magnus Doctor Universalis 1280/1980*, ed. Gerbert Megyer and Albert Zimmermann, Walberberger Studien: Philosophisch Theologische Hochschule der Dominikaner, (Mainz: Grünewald, 1980), 47–58.

89. Albertus Magnus, *Super Dionysii Mysticam Theologiam et Epistulas*, ed. P. Simon, published as Tome 37, pars 2 of *Opera omnia*, (Aschendorff, 1978) Epistula septima, ss. 2: "... quamvis quidam, quia nesciunt, omnibus modis velint impugnare usum philosophiae, et maxime in praedicatoribus, ubi nullus eis resistit, tamquam bruta animalia blasphemantes in his quae ignorant."

90. John Marenbon, "Bonaventure, the German Dominicans and the new translations," in *Medieval philosophy*, ed. John Marenbon, Routledge history of philosophy 3 (New York: Routledge, 1998): 225–240.

91. For three sound treatments of Thomas' life and thought, see Brian Davies, *The thought of Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992); Jean-Pierre Torrell, *Initiation à Saint Thomas d'Aquin: sa personne et son oeuvre*, Vestigia 13 (Fribourg: Editions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse, 1993) and James A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas*. Two brief works on Aquinas and his historical context are David Knowles, *The historical context of the philosophical works of St. Thomas Aquinas*, The Aquinas Society of London, Aquinas paper no. 30 (London: Blackfriars, 1958) and Edward Synan, "Aquinas and his age," *Calgary Aquinas studies* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1978): 49–64.

92. In addition to Dieter Berg's *Armut und Wissenschaft*; see Ulrich Horst, "Mendikant und Theologe. Thomas v. Aquin in den Armutsbewegungen seiner Zeit (zu Contra retrahentes c. 15)," *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 57 (1996): 13031; idem., *Evangelische Armut und Kirche. Thomas von Aquin und die Armutskontroversen des und beginnenden 14 Jahrhunderts*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte

des Dominicanerorderns, NF 1 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1992).

93. Bernard McGinn, "Chapter 7. The abbot and the doctors: Joachim, Aquinas and Bonaventure," in *The Calabrian abbot: Joachim of Fiore in the history of western thought* (New York: Macmillan, 1985): 207–235.

94. R. H. and M. A. Rouse, "Ordinatio and compilatio revisited," in *Ad litteram: authoritative texts and their medieval readers*, 127.

95. O. Lottin, "Saint Thomas d'Aquin à la faculté des arts de Paris aux approches de 1277," *RTAM* 16 (1949): 292–313.

96. Leff, *Paris and Oxford*, 189.

97. A. Callebaut, "Jean Pecham O.F.M. et l'Augustinisme," *AFH* 18 (1925): 441–472.

98. Stephen Brown, "Henry of Ghent's "De reductione artium ad theologiam," in *Thomas Aquinas and his legacy*, ed. David M. Gallagher, Studies in philosophy and the history of philosophy 39 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1994): 194–206.

99. Daniel Callus, "The problem of unity of form and Richard Knapwell," in *Mélanges offerts à Étienne Gilson* (Toronto: PIMS, 1959), 134.

100. M. T. d'Alverny, "Un adversaire de St. Thomas: Petrus Iohannis Olivi," in *Comm. St.*, 2: 179–218.

101. See John Wippel, "The Condemnations of 1270 and 1277 at Paris," *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 7 (1977): 169–201.

102. R. Wielockx, "Autour du Process de Thomas d'Aquin," in *Thomas von Aquin*, ed. A. Zimmermann, (Berlin: 1988): 413–438.

103. Leland Wilshire, "The Oxford Condemnations of 1277 and the intellectual life of the thirteenth century universities," in *Aspectus et affectus: essays and editions in Grosseteste and medieval intellectual life in honor of Richard C. Dales*, ed. Gunar Freibergs, AMS studies in the Middle Ages, 23 (New York: AMS Press, 1993): 113–124. See also Daniel Callus, *The Condemnation of St. Thomas at Oxford* (Westminster, MD: Newman Bookshop, 1946).

104. Daniel Callus, "Richard Knapwell," 159.

105. *CUP*, 1, 627: "Credentes autem fratres Predicatores Oxonii commorantes, quod nos opinionem illam a predecessor nostro, qui sui erat Ordinis, reprobata persequeremur in ejusdem Ordinis prejudicium ... quod illam et alias opiniones fratris Thome volebant contra omnes viventes homines defensare." and *ibid.*, 1, 625: "Causam vero opinionum bone memorie fratris Thome de Aquino, quas fratres ipsi opiniones sui Ordinis esse dicunt. ..."

106. Damasus Trapp, "Augustinian theology of the fourteenth century: notes on editions, marginalia, opinions and booklore," *Augustiniana* 6 (1956), 25.

107. David Burr, "The *Correctorium* controversy and the origins of the *Usus pauper* controversy," *Speculum* 60 (1985): 331–342.

108. M.-T. Alverny, "Un adversaire de St. Thomas," 179–218.

109. On the *Correctorium* controversy, see David Burr, "The *Correctorium* controversy and the origins of the *Usus Pauper* controversy," *Speculum* 60 (1985): 331–342; R. Cretyens, "Autour de la littéraire des correctoires," *AFP* 12 (1942): 313–330; P. Glorieux, "La littérature des correctoires: Simples notes," *Revue thomiste* 33 (1928): 69–96; Martin Grabmann, "Le "*Correctorium corruptorii*" de dominicain Johannes Quidort de Paris (+1306)," *Revue néo-scholastique* (Louvain) 19 (1912): 404–418; Mark D. Jordan, "The controversy of the "*Correctia*" and the limits of metaphysics," *Speculum* 57 (1982): 292–314 and Auguste Pelzer, "Prétendus auteurs des répliques au correctoire de Guillaume de la Mare," *AFP* 13 (1943): 95–100.

110. Martin Hoenen, "The literary reception of Thomas Aquinas' view on the provability of the eternity of the world in de la Mare's *Correctorium* (1278–9) and the *Correctoria Corruptorii* (1279-ca. 1286)," in *The Eternity of the world in the thought of Thomas Aquinas and his contemporaries*, ed. J. Wissink, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters (Leiden: Brill, 1990): 39–68.

111. "Le Constitutiones Generales Antiquae: dei Fratri Minori nella redazione Assisana del 1279," ed. G. Abate, *Miscellanea Francescana* 35 (1935), 80: "Nullus frater audeat opinionem aliquam asserere vel etiam approbare scienter que a magistris nostris communiter reprobatur, nec opinionem singularem cuiuscumque suspectam et alumnibilem, maxime circa fidem vel mores, audeat defensare, "et potissime opinionem a domino Episcopo et a magistris Parisiensibus reprobata," et qui contra fecerit, nisi admonitus per ministrum, respuerit, ab omni doctrina officio sit suspectus..." See Burbach, "Early Dominican and Franciscan legislation," 147 for a discussion.

112. "Definitiones Capituli Generalis Argentinae," ed. G. Fussenegger, *AFH* 26 (1933), 139: "Item minister generalis imponit ministris provincialibus, quod non permittant multiplicari Summam fratris Thome nisi apud lectores rationabiliter intelligentes et hoc non nisi cum declarationibus fratris Wilhelmi de Mara, non in marginibus postis sed in quaternis; et huiusmodi declarationes non scribantur per aliquem secularem..."

113. *Ibid.*, 147, ff.46: "Item minister generalis imponit ministris provincialibus, quod non permittant multiplicari summam fratris Thome nisi apud lectores rationabiliter intelligentes et hoc nonnisi cum declarationibus fratris Wilhelmi de Mara, non in marginibus positis sed in quaternis; et huiusmodi declarationes non scribantur per aliquem secularem."

114. *Ibid.*: "Item mandat capitulum generale, quod ministri sint diligentes contra dogmatizantes doctrinam corruptam publice vel occulte, ut eos diligenter moneant et corrigant; et nisi revocaverint et destiterint requisiti privent eos predicti ministri officiis lectionis, predicti ministri officiis lectionis, predicationis, confessionis, diffinitionis et discretionis ad capitula. Qui sic non destiterint, fratrum societate priventur et tandem incarcerationentur, si in suis erroribus perseverent, ne corrupti corrumpant alios et pervertant."

115. *Ibid.*, 149: "Nullus etiam frater audeat aliquam opinionem corruptam, non sanam vel ab episcopo et magistris Parisiensibus communiter reprobata scienter asserere vel etiam approbare publice vel occulte, nec opinionem singularem cuiuscunque calumpniabilem vel suspectam maxime circa fidem vel mores audeat defensare."

116. See Franz Ehrle, "Der Kampf um die Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin in den ersten fünfzig Jahren nach seinem Tode," *ZKT* 37 (1913): 266–318; Hadrianus Krizovljan, "Primordia Scholae Franciscanae et Thomismus," *Collectanea Franciscana* 31 (1961): 133–175; and P. Ambrosius Bačk, *Ex Primordiis Scholae Thomisticae* (Rome: Angelicum, 1928).

117. For instance, in 1287 the Augustinian general chapter ordered all of its teachers and students to defend the present and future works of Giles of Rome. See *CUP*, 1, 633–634, no. 522; 2, 12, no. 542. For Scotism, see C. Bérubé, "La première école scotiste," in *Preuve et raisons à l'université de Paris. Logique, ontologie et théologie au XIV^e siècle*, ed. Z. Kaluza and P. Vignaux (Paris: Vrin, 1984): 9–24.

118. F. Ehrle, "Arnaldo de Villanova ed i 'Thomatiste,'" *Gregorianum* 1 (1920): 475–501.

119. Coloman Viola, "L'école thomiste au Moyen Âge," in *La philosophie contemporaine Chroniques nouvelles*, 6/1, Philosophie et science au Moyen Âge (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1990): 345–377.

120. For comparison of the philosophies of the early Thomists, see W. Bucichowski, "Le principe d'individuation dans la question de Henri de Lubek 'Utrum materia sit principium individuationis,'" in *MPP* 21 (1975): 89–113; F. Kelley's, "Some observations on Ockham's *factum* theory and *esse objectivum* in Hervaeus Natalis," *Franciscan Studies* 38 (1978): 260–282; and "Two early English Thomists, Thomas Sutton and Robert Orford vs. Henry of Ghent," *The Thomist* 45 (1981): 347–387; P. Stella, "A proposito di Petro Palude (in I. Sent., d. 43, q. 1): la question inedita 'Utrum Deum esse infinitum in perfectione et vigore possit efficaci ratione probari' di Erveo Natalis," *Salesianum* 22 (1960): 245–325; C. Trabold, "Esse und *essentia* nach Johannes Quidort von Paris im Vergleich mit Thomas von Aquin" (Ph.D. diss., Rome, Pont. Athen. Anselmianum, 1958); and J. F. Wippel, "The relationship between essence and existence in late thirteenth century thought: Giles of Rome, Henry of Ghent, Godfrey of Fontaines and James of Viterbo," in *Ancient and medieval philosophies of existence*, ed. P. Morewedge (New York: Routledge, 1981).

121. Stefan Swiezawski, "Quelques déformations de la pensée de St. Thomas dans la tradition thomiste," in *Aquinas and the problems of his times*, ed. G. Verbeke and D. Verhelst, Mediaevalia Lovaniensia 1 (Louvain: Nijhoff, 1976): 38–54.

122. Twentieth-century scholars have endowed the term "Augustinianism" with a number of connotations. In this dissertation, I am employing the term in its classical, or neo-scholastic sense, i.e., defining it in terms of its anti-Pelagian emphasis. For a discussion of the various definitions of the term, see Dennis Janz, "Towards a definition of late medieval augustinianism," *The Thomist* 4 (1980): 117–127.

123. P. Hadrianus a Krizovljan, "Primordia Scholae Franciscanae et Thomismus," *Collectanea Franciscana* 31 (1961), 172. For further discussion, see P. Glorieux, "Jean Quidort et la distinction réelle de l'essence et de l'existence," *RTAM* 18 (1951): 151–157.

124. W. Senko, "Les opinions d'Hervé Nédellec au sujet de l'essence et de l'existence," *MPP* 10 (1961): 59–84.

125. William Wallace, "Aristotle in the Middle Ages," *DMA* 1: 456–469 and Gordon Leff, *Paris and Oxford Universities in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries* (New York: Wiley, 1968): 239; and Pierre Mandonnet, "Les premières disputes sur la distinction réelle entre l'essence et l'existence," *Revue thomiste* 18 (1910): 741–765.

126. Armand Maurer, "The unity of a science: St. Thomas and the Nominalists," in *Comm. St.* 2: 269–292.

127. Leff, *Paris and Oxford*, 239.

128. William de la Mare, *Corr. Thom.* 82 (Bibl. Thom., 9): 331–332.

129. J. I. Catto, "Theology and theologians 1220–1320," in *The early Oxford schools*, ed. J. I. Catto, The history of the University of Oxford 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 503.

130. See I. Brady, "The development of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception in the fourteenth century after Aureoli," *FS* 15 (1955): 175–202; F de Guimâres, "La doctrine des théologiens sur l'Immaculée Conception de 1250 à 1350," *Études franciscaines*, ns 2, no. 9 (Dec., 1952): 181–205; 4 (June, 1953): 167–187; and, for an example of the early polemics, "Ioan de Polliaco et Ioan de Neapoli. Quaestiones Disp. De Immaculata Conception," ed. C. Balić in *Bibliotheca Mariana Medii Aevi* 1 (Sibenici: Kačić, 1931): 73–95.

131. See, for instance, Charles Zuckermann, "Some texts of Bernard of Auvergne on papal power," *RTAM* 49 (1982): 174–204; M. Griesbach, "John of Paris as a representative of thomistic political philosophy," in *An Etienne Gilson tribute*, ed. C. J. O'Neal, (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1959): 33–50 and Odd Langholm, *Economics in the medieval schools: wealth, exchange, value, money and usury according to the Paris theological tradition, 1200–1350*, Studien und Text zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 29 (Leiden: Brill, 1992).

132. "Iniungimus districte fratri Raymundo de Medullione et fratri Iohanni Vigorosi lectori Montispelessui. Quod cum festinatione vadant in angliam inquisitori diligenter super facto fratrum. Qui in scandalum ordinis destraxerunt de scriptis venerabilis patris fratris Thome de Aquino." It is interesting to speculate the extent to which the General Chapter's fears were fueled by past incidents of rebellion on behalf of the English province. The most notable of these was the Oxford convents' refusal to admit foreign friar preachers into their *studia generalia*. Records of the incident can be found in *Acta*, 1, 110. For background see Edward Tracy Brett, *Humbert of Romans: his life and views of thirteenth-century society*, Studies and texts 67 (Toronto: PIMS, 1984) 51–55; William Hinnebusch, *The early English Friars Preachers*, Dissertationes Historicae, 14 (Rome: Institutum Historicum FF. Praedicatorum, 1951), 341; and Knowles, *Religious orders*, 1: 218–219.

133. *Acta*, 1, 199: "Quibus ex nunc plenam damus auctoritatem in capite et in membris. Qui quos culpabiles invenerint in predictis. Puniendi. Extra provinciam emittendi. Et omni officio privandi. Plenam habeant potestatem."

134. Historians differ as to the extent to which Thomism had made inroads into the English province by 1277–1279 and thus, also disagree as to the extent to which the English lectors may have posed a threat. For a discussion see Hinnebusch, *Early English Friar Preachers*, 341; and M.-D. Chenu, "La première diffusion du Thomisme à Oxford, Knapwell et ses notes sur les Sentences," *AHDLM* 3 (1928): 185–200.

135. *Acta*, 1, 204: "Cum venerabilis vir memorie recolende fr. Thomas de Aquino, suo conversatione laudabili et scriptis suis multum honoraverit ordinem, nec sit aliquatenus tolerandum, quod de ipso vel scriptis eius aliqui irreverenter et indecenter loquantur, eciam aliter sencientes, iniungimus prioribus provincialibus et conventualibus et eorum vicariis ac visitatoribus universis, quod is quos invenerint excedentes in predictis, punire acriter non postponent."

136. *Mulcahey*, "First the bow," 175.

137. *Acta*, 1, 1280, 209: "Monemus. Quod lectores et magistri et fratres alii questionibus theologicis et moralibus potius quam philosophicis et curiosis intendunt."

138. *Ibid.*, 1, 235: "Districtius iniungimus et mandamus, ut fratres omnes et singuli, prout sciunt et possunt, efficacem dent operam ad doctrinam venerabilis magistri fratris Thome de Aquino recolende memorie promovendam et saltem ut est opinio defendendam, et si qui contrarium facere, attemptaverint assertive sive sint magistri sive bacallarii, lectores, priores et alii fratres eciam aliter sencientes, ipso facto, ab officiis propriis et graciis ordinis sint suspensi, donec per magistrum ordinis vel generale capitulum sint restituti, et nichilominus per prelatos suos seu visitatores iuxta culparum exigentiam. Condignam reportent penam."

139. *Ibid.*, 1, 1298, 290: "Cum plures querimonie per aliquos religiosos contra fratres nostri ordinis in Romana curia deponatur ordinamus quod priores provinciales in suis provinciis inquirent et inquire faciant de iniuriis nostro ordini illatis a ceteris religiosis quibuscumque contra privilegia et libertates nostras et quas diligenti examinatione prehabita certas et manifestas invenerint nunciari procuratori ordinis non obmittant."

140. *Ibid.*, 1, 1297, 284: "Admonemus quod cum ex ordinatione status nostri pacem ecclesie querere fovere ac tueri pro viribus debemus districte precipimus fratribus universis in virtute obediencie ne quis illis contra dominum nostrum summum pontificem dominum Bonifacium et sanctam Romanam ecclesiam se erexerunt audeat occulte vel manifeste impendere consilium auxilium vel favorem mandantes nichilominus et districte iniungentes quod in predicacionibus publicis et alias cum fuerit oportunitas predicent doceant et constanter asserant dominum Bonifacium esse verum papam successorum petri et vicarium Ihesu Christi."

141. *Ibid.*, 1, 1303, 321: "Cum ex negligencia prelatorum regulares observancie et ordinationes capitulorum nimis notabiliter negligantur iniungimus prioribus universis et vicariis eorumdem quod circa observanciam predictorum et punicionem transgressorum curam adhibeant diligentem qui autem

circa premissa fuerint negligentes per priores provinciales e visitores debite puniantur.”

142. Ibid., 1, 1296, 280: “Volumus et ordinamus ac districti iniungimus prioribus universis quod in singulis conventibus firmi et securi carceres habeantur fratres autem pro culpis suis non incarcerationum absque deliberatione previa et consilio descretorum postquam autem sic incarcerationati fuerint inde non educantur de facili et sine prioris provincialis et diffinitorum consilio et assensu.”

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

1. Kristeller, “Thomism and the Italian thought,” 39.
2. Mark Jordan, “The controversy of the *Correctoria* and the limits of metaphysics,” *Speculum* 57 (1982): 292–314.
3. Recent years have witnessed a growing corpus of literature which treats the dissemination of Aquinas’ writings. For a beginning, see Louis Bataillon, “La diffusione manoscritta dei commenti biblici di Sant Tommaso d’Aquino,” *Angelicum* 7 (1994): 579–590.
4. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas D’Aquino*, 338.
5. Roensch, *Early Thomistic school*, 90.
6. The three Oxford Dominicans who replied to William de la Mare were Richard Knapwell, Robert Orford and William Macclesfield. See M.-D. Chenu, “La première diffusion du thomisme à Oxford. Knapwell et ses ‘notes’ sur les sentences,” *AHDLM* 3 (1928): 105–184. For Sutton, see especially Francis Kelley, “The Thomists and their opponents at Oxford in the last part of the thirteenth century,” (Ph.D. diss., Oxford University, 1977); idem., “Thomas Sutton’s place in the development of Aristotelianism and Thomism at Oxford in the last quarter of the thirteenth century,” (Oxford B. Litt. Thesis 1966) and F. Pelster, “Thomas von Sutton O. Pr., ein Oxforder Verteidiger der thomistischen Lehre,” *ZKT*, 46 (1922).
7. The literature on Knapwell is extensive. For a beginning, see Callus, “Richard Knapwell,” 123–160; Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars*, 342–356; and Franz Ehrle, “John Peckham über den Kampf des Augustinismus und Aristotelismus in der zweiten Hälfte des XIII. Jahrhunderts,” *ZKT* 13 (1889): 172–193 and “De Kampf und die Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin in den ersten 50 Jahren nach seinem Tod,” *ibid.*, 37 (1913): 226–318.
8. Francis Cunningham, *Essence and existence in Thomism: a mental vs. the “real distinction?”* (Landham: University of America Press, 1988): 322–325.
9. Hothum’s letter can be found in Callus, “Richard Knapwell”: 130–131, ff. 20. Pecham’s replies, which paraphrase Hothum’s complaints are contained in *CUP*, 1, 624–627, nos. 517–518.
10. *Acta*, 1, 1286, 235. For the text of the legislation, see *infra*, [chapter 2](#), ff. 140.
11. See J.E. Murdoch, “From social to intellectual factors: an aspect of the unitary character of later medieval learning,” in *The cultural context of medieval learning*, ed. J. E. Murdoch and E. D. Sylla (Boston: Reidel, 1975): 271–348 and E. D. Sylla, “The Oxford calculators,” in *The Cambridge history of later medieval philosophy*, ed. N. Kretzmann, A. Kenny, and J. Pinborg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982): 540–563.
12. M. Grabmann, “La scuola tomistica Italiana nel XIII e principio del XIV secolo: Ricerche sui Manoscritti,” *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* 15 (1923): 99–155.
13. Idem., “Albert of Brescia OP (+1314) und sein Werk ‘De officio sacerdotis,’” *Divus Thomas* (Freiburg, 1940): 5–38.
14. W. Senko, “La déformation de l’<<esse>> chez les premiers thomistes,” *MPP* (1961): 59–84. For further information on Remigio, see Charles T. Davis, “Remigio de’ Girolami, O.P., (d. 1319) lector of S. Maria Novella in Florence,” in *Le scuole degli ordini mendicanti*: 281–304; as well as the two studies by E. Panella, *Per lo studio di fra Remigio dei Girolami (+1319). Contra falsos professores ecclesiae*, *Memorie Domenicane*, N.S. 10 (1979): 11–313 and “Un’introduzione alla filosofia in uno ‘studium’ dei fratri Predicatori,” *ibid.*, 12 (1981): 27–126. Whether or not Remigio was actually Dante’s teacher has been neither proved nor disproved. For his influence on Dante, however, see S. Orlandi, “Fra Remigio de’ Girolami e Dante,” *ibid.*, 84 (1967): 8–43, 90–127.
15. *Acta Prov. Rom.*, 169: “... quod lectores et baccellarii legant de Sententiis et non de Summa Thome, ...”
16. Jacques Quétif and Jacques Échard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum recensiti, notisque historicis et criticis*, 4 vols. (New York: Franklin, 1959), 3: 295–296. Hereafter cited as *SOP*.
17. A. D’Amato, “Bombologno da Bologna,” *Sapienza* 1 (1948): 81–83.
18. I. Frank, *Hausstudium und Universitätsstudium der Wiener Dominikaner bis 1500*, *Archiv für Oesterreichische Geschichte* 127 (Graz-Wien-Köln, 1968).
19. See R. Imbach, “(Néo)platonisme médiéval, Proclus latin et l’école dominicaine allemande,” *RSPT*

110 (1978): 427–448 which updates the material found in M. Grabmann, “Forschungen zur Geschichte der ältesten deutschen Thomistenschule des Dominikanerordens,” *Xenia Thomistica* 3 (1925): 189–231.

20. Jean-Pierre Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas: the person and his work*, trans. Robert Royal (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1996), 313. See also R. Imbach and U. Lindblad, “*Compilatio rudis ac puerilis*. Hinweise und Materialien zu Nicolaus von Strassburg und seiner Summa,” *FZPT* 32 (1985): 122–155.

21. A. de Libera, *Introduction à la mystique rhénane d’Albert le Grand à Maître Eckhart*, Sagesse chrétienne (Paris: O.E.I.L., 1984).

22. Intriguingly, what we do see coming out of Bologna, between 1277 and 1325, is an explosion of Aristotelian commentaries. Thus, Corrado d’Asoci, provincial of Lombardy between 1311 and 1313, taught and commented upon Aristotle’s *Ethics* and *Metaphysics*. (*SOP*, 1: 273–274). Between 1310 and 1320, Guido Vernani da Rimini commented on Aristotle’s *Ethics*, *de Anima* and *Rhetorica*. (*SOP*, 2: 75–78).

23. Bernard’s removal from office was the result of his defense of the recently deposed Munio of Zamorra. See *Act. prov. Prov.*, 1:338; 345.

24. Martin Grabmann, “Die Widerleben und Weiterwerken des moraltheologischen Schrifttums des hl. Thomas von Aquin im Mittelalter,” *Divus Thomas* (Freiburg) 25 (1947): 5–6 and Mulcahey, “*First the bow ...*,” 351.

25. Maurice Burbach, “Early Dominican and Franciscan legislation,” *Mediaeval Studies*, 4 (1942), 149. Hinnebusch feels that Burbach is “far too harsh” in his characterization of the three as “anti-Thomist.” See *History*, 2, 183, n. 45.

26. The seminal work on Dietrich is E. Krebs, *Meister Dietrich (Theodoricus Teutonicus de Vriberg). Sein Leben, seine Werke, seine Wissenschaft*, BGPMA 5 (Munster, 1906). The best introductions to Dietrich among recent studies are R. Imbach, “Gravis iactura verae doctrinae. Prolegomena zu einer Interpretation der Schrift De ente et essentia Dietrichs von Freiberg, O.P.,” *FZPT* 26 (1979): 369–425 and “Prétendue primauté de l’être sur le connaître. Perspectives cavalières sur Thomas d’Aquin et l’école dominicaine allemand,” in *Lectionum varietates. Hommage à Paul Vignaux*, Etudes de Phil. Méd. 65 (Paris, 1991): 121–132.

27. *Acta*, 2, 20.

28. Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas*, 314.

29. Krebs, *Meister Dietrich*: 5–6.

30. Gilson, *History of Christian philosophy*: 433–437.

31. Dietrich of Frieberg, *Opera omnia*. 1: *Schriften zur Intellekttheorie*, ed. by Brukhardt Mojsich with an introduction by Kurt Flasch (Hamburg, 1977) and 2: *Schriften zur Metaphysik und Theologie*, ed. Ruedi Imbach, Maria Rita Pagnoni-Sturlese (Hamburg, 1980).

32. M. L. Führer, “Introduction,” in Dietrich of Freiberg, *Treatise on the intellect and the intelligible*, Mediaeval philosophical texts in translation 31 (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1992), 4.

33. Eugene Krebs, “<<De esse et essentia>> de Thierry de Friberg,” *Revue néo-scholastique* 18 (1911), 516.

34. Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas*, 314.

35. Loris Sturlese, “Alle origini della mistica speculativa tedesca. Antichi testi su Teodorico di Freiburg,” *Medioevo* 3 (1977): 21–87.

36. R. Imbach, “Prétendue primauté de l’être sur le connaître,” 121–132.

37. Joseph Koch, “Kritische Studien zum Leben Meister Eckharts,” *AFP* 29 (1929): 5–51; 30 (1960): 5–52.

38. He was also attacked by Jean Picard of Lichtenberg. See Z. K. Siemiatkowska, “Deux découvertes au sujet de Jacques de Metz et de Jean Picardi,” *MPP* (1961): 29–32.

39. See Bruno Decker, *Die Gotteslehre des Jakob von Metz*; Theodore Kohler, *Der Begriff der Einheit und ihr ontologisches Prinzip nach dem Sentenzenkommentar der Jakob von Metz*, *OP*, *Studia Anselmiana* 58 (Rome: Herder, 1971); and Lothar Ullrich, *Fragen der Schöpfungslehre nach Jakob von Metz O.P. Eine Vergleichende Untersuchung zu Sentenzenkommentaren aus der Dominikanerschule um 1300*, *Erfurter Theologische Studien* 20 (Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1966).

40. A. Emmen, “De origine controversiae circa peccatum originale in schola dominicana saeculo XIII. Relationes inter Jacobum Metensem et Durandum illustratae ex operibus Duns Scoti et Guillelmi de Nottingham,” *Divus Thomas* 27 (1943): 385–400.

41. *Cat. Stams.*, MOPH, 18, 64, 28: “Fr. Iacobus Metensis scripsit lecturam super sententias.”

42. Some scholars have hypothesized that James may have been silenced but there is no evidence one way or the other.

43. Theodore Kohler, “Wissenschaft und Evidenz. Beobachtungen zum wissenschaftstheoretischen Ansatz des Jakob von Metz,” in *Sapientiae Procerum Amore*, *Studia Anselmiana* 63 (Rome: Anselmiana, 1974): 369–414.

44. L. Hodi, "Die Grundfragen der Sakramentenlehre nach Hervaeus Natalis O.P. (1323)," *Münchener Theologische Studien* 10 (Munich, 1956).
45. The work was christened by Joseph Koch in 1927; this was not its original title.
46. Joseph Koch, "Jakob von Metz O.P., der Lehrer des Durandus de S. Porciano," *AHDLM* 4 (1929/30): 169–198.
47. For James' views on original sin, see Cyril Vollert, *The Doctrine of Hervaeus Natalis*: 89–92.
48. Kenneth Plotnick, *Hervaeus Natalis OP*, 10.
49. Koch, "Jakob von Metz, OP der Lehrer des Durandus," 192–193.
50. The most critical biography of Natalis is A. de Guimarães, "Hervé Noël (1323): Étude Biographique," *AFP* 8 (1938): 5–81. See also B. Haureau, "Hervé Nédélec, Général de Frères Prêcheurs," *HLF* 34 (1915): 308–315.
51. *Chronica et chonicorum excerpta historiam ordinis praedicatorum illustrantia*, ed. B. M. Reichert, MOPH 7 (Rome: In domo generalita, 1904).
52. de Guimarães, "Hervé Noël (†1323)," 13–14.
53. *Ibid.*, 22.
54. *CUP*, 2: 101–102, n. 634. See also Hauréau, "Hervé Nédélec," 34, 308.
55. Bernard Gui, *Priores Provinciales in Provincia Franciae*, in Pignon, *Cat.*, 82: "Frater Erveus Brito, magister in theologia, successit fratri Guilelmo de Kayoco, alectus in capitulo provinciali Carnotensi in festo Exaltationis Sanctae Crucis anno 1309."
56. Koch, "Durandus de S. Porciano, O.P.," 61, n. 7; Fallon, *Notion of truth*, 198, n. 31.
57. Pignon, *Chronica Compendiosa de Capitulis Generalibus*, MOPH, 18, 40: "Anno Domini 1318 capitulum generale fuit in Lugduno, ubi electus est in magistrum Ordinis frater Hervaeus Natalis, de conventu Montis Relaxi..." and *Acta*, 2, 106: "In hoc capitulo electus est frater Herveus a provinciali Franciae: qui fuit nobilior clericus totius mundi temporibus suis: electus unanimiter...."
58. J. Koch, "Der Prozess gegen den Magister Johannes de Polliaco und seine Vorgeschichte," *RTAM* 5 (1933): 391–422.
59. Pignon, *Chronica Compendiosa*, 41: "Anno Domini 1323 capitulum generale fuit in Barcelona; provinciale in Claramonte, et illo anno obiit magister Ordinis ..." and *Acta*, 2, 106: "Qui post nimios labores eundo ad curiam Romanam obiit Narbonae cum maxima devotione post magnam infirmitatem spiritum Deo reddidit praesentibus multis magnis magistris. ..."
60. Daniel Mortier, "Moers nouvelles," in his *Histoire des maitres généraux de l'ordre des frères Prêcheurs*, 2: 545–547.
61. *Acta*, 1318, 2, 107: "Cum ex eo quod priores et eorum loca tenentes ac fratres ceteri a sequela communitatis se retrahunt ... injungimus prioribus universis ut a choro et a refecitorio se notabiliter non absentent. ..."
62. See *Ibid.*, 1328, 2, 137.
63. Such was the case at Hereford. In fact, John Bromyard's *Summa praedicatorum* was written precisely because the friars lacked access to the preaching tools they needed to implement the *cura animarum*. See Peter Brinkley, "John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans," in *Centres of learning: learning and location in pre-modern Europe and the Near East*, ed. Jan Willem Drijvers and Alasdair MacDonald, Brill's studies in intellectual history 61 (Leiden: Brill, 1995): 255–256.
64. As in n.63 supra, *Ibid.*, 2, 123, 1320: "De criminibus publicis non punitis non revelandis ..."
65. *Litterae encyclicae magistrorum generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum ab anno 1233 usque ad annum 1376*, ed. B. M. Reichert, MOPH 5 (Rome: In Domo Generalita, 1900), 224: "Et quia prelati sunt apostolorum, qui habuerunt primicias spiritus, successors, gratis accipientes, que solius sunt spiritus ab eisdem, ne murmuraveritis contra eos. ..."
66. *Ibid.*, 221: "Demum cum sanctissimus pater ac dominus dominus Iohannes summus pontifex devotissimas literas mandaverit instanti capitulo generali, in quibus blande ac dulciter nos monuit de pluribus, que tenemur facere et servare, volo ac impono, quod quilibet conventus dictes literas faciat annotari, et fratres omnes cum diligencia servent omnia, que continentur in eisdem."
67. Eugen Hillenbrand, "Kurie und Generalkapitel des Predigerordens unter Johannes XXII. (1316–1334)," in *Adel und Kirche: Gerd Tellenbach zum 65 Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern*, ed. Josef Fleckenstein und Karl Schmidt (Freiburg: Herder, 1968): 499–515.
68. A bibliographic catalogue containing most of Natalis' known works is included in the article on Natalis in Roensch, *Early Thomistic School*, 106–117.
69. For Natalis' conflict with Henry of Ghent, see Werner Schollgen, *Das Problem der Willensfreiheit bei Heinrich von Ghent und Hervaeus Natalis: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kampfes zwischen Augustinismus und Aristotelismus in der Hochscholastik*, Abhandlungen aus Ethik un Moral 6 (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1975) and C. Paolo, *La prima critica di Erveo di N'edellec alla antropologia di*

Enrico di Gand (Rome Salesiana, 1974); for his debate with Aureol, see D. Perler, "Peter Aureol vs. Hervaeus Natalis on Intentionality. A text edition with introductory remarks," *AHDLMA*, 61 (1994): 227–262.

70. Bernardus Lombard, *IVSent*, lect. 8 q. 2. cited in Koch, op. cit., 211: "Doctor subtilissimus hurus scole."

71. P. Elter, "Un ouvrage inconnu de Hervé Nédellec," *Gregorianum* 4 (1923): 211–240.

72. Koch, *Durandus*, 218.

73. Martin, "La table des matières de l'ouvrage 'De quatuor materiis' d'Hervé de Nédellec, O.P.," *RSPT* 18 (1929), 291.

74. A. Fries, "Quaestiones super quantum librum sententiarum Hervaeo Natali, O.P.," *Angelicum* 13 (1935), 529.

75. Hauréau, "Hervé Nédellec," 315.

76. E. B. Allen, "Hervaeus Natalis: an early 'thomist' on the notion of being," *Medieval studies* 22 (1960): 1–14; and Joseph Mannath, "Harvey of Nedellec's proofs for the existence of God: 'De Cognitione Primi Principii,' qq III–IV" (1), *Salesianum* 31 (1969): 46–112.

77. Fallon, *Notion of truth*, 202.

78. For example, III Sent. (Moreau), d. 6, q. 1, 295: "... volunt imponere hoc S. Thomae ... Hanc autem potitionem credo non esse veram nec esse de mente Sci. Thomae"; *Ibid.*, IV Sent., d. 8, q. 5, 344: "Quod autem sit contra intentionem sancti Thomae proba ..."; *Ibid.*, I Sent., d. 4, q. 2, 45: "... volunt quod haec sit intentio venerabilis doctoris S. Thomae ... falsum est"; *Ibid.*, I Sent., d. 9, q. 1, 66: "Quidem autem de quo mirandum est imponunt sancto Thomae ..."; and *Quodlibet* I, 1. 8, 17va. (ed. Zimarra): "... frater Thomas intellexit quod Aristoteles ignoravit creationem quantum ad modum qui est habere novitatem essendi ... et sic frater Thomas accipit quando dicit quod Aristoteles non erravit circa creationem sed circa motum. ..."

79. P. Fournier, "Durand de Saint-Pourçain théologien," *HLF* 37 (1938); J. Koch, *Durandus de S. Porciano, O.P.: Forschungen zum Streit um Thomas von Aquin zu Beginn des 14 Jahrhunderts*, BGPMA, 26 (Munich, 1927) and *idem.*, "Der Verteidigung der Theologie des Hl. Thomas von Aquin durch den Dominikanerorden gegenüber Durandus de S. Porciano, O. Pr.," *Xenia Thomistica* 3 (1925): 327–362; Ludwig Ott, *Die Lehre des Durandus de S. Porciano O.P vom Weihesakrament dargestellt nach den verschiedenen Redaktionen seines Sentenzenkommentars und nach der Diskussion der Dominikanertheologie des beginnenden 14 Jahrhunderts*, Münchener Universitäts-Schriften. Katholisch-Theologisch Fakultät. Veröffentlichungen der Grabmann-Institute, n.t. 17 (Munich: Schöningh, 1972) and Johann von Stüfeler, "Bemerkungen zur Konkreten Lehre des Durandus von St. Pourçain," *BGPMA*, suppl. 3, 2 (1925): 1080–1090.

80. Durandus, Prologue, *Commentary*: "... qui a pueritia in fide et obedientia Romanae Ecclesiae nutriti sumus."

81. *CUP*, 2, 102.

82. *Catalogus Upsalensis*, MOPH 18 (1936), 76: "Fr. Durandus, episcopus, lector sacri palatii et magister in theologiam fecit triplex scriptum super libros sententiarum; item duo quodlibeta magna. ..."

83. The diocese of Limoux had formerly been a part of the Archdiocese of Narbonne. Its creation was part of John XXII's overall strategy of carving up large, unmanageable dioceses in order to promote centralization. It was suppressed on February 13, 1318 when John XXII transferred Durandus to the see of Le Puy en Velay which was under immediate jurisdiction of the pope. For a short discussion of John XXII's generation of smaller dioceses and the results, see Mollat, *The Popes at Avignon*, 18–19.

84. Fournier, "Durand de Saint-Pourçain," 11.

85. Mollat, "Lettres Communes," no. 23781, 13 November 1325: "... iurisdictione ... quam capitulum de antiqua et praescripta consuetudine asserunt se habere ... super quodam iuramento solito praestari per eundem episcopum. ..."

86. Eubel, *Hierarchia*, 349.

87. See "Die Tabulae Ludwigs von Valladolid im Chor der Predigerbrüder von St. Jakob in Paris," ed. H. Scheeben, *AFP* 1 (1931), 255: "Dominus frater Durandus de Sancto Porciano, alumnus doctor ingeniosus, episcopus Meldensis scripsit tribus vicibus super IIII libros sententiarum valde notabiliter," and *Cat. Upsalensis*, MOPH 18 (1936), 76: "Fr. Durandus, episcopus, lector sacri palatii et magister in theologia, fecit triplex scriptum super libros sententiarum; item duo quodlibeta magna. ..."

88. See A. J. Vanderjagt, *Laurens Pignon, OP: Confessor of Philip the Good. Ideas on Jurisdiction and the Estates* (Venlo: Miélot, 1985) and Maria Beonio-Brocchieri Fumagalli, "Il 'De origine iurisdictionum' di Durando di S. Porciano," *Rivista di Filosofia new scolastica*, 14 (1978): 193–206.

89. Jürgen Miethke, "Das *Votum De Paupertate Christi et Apostolorum* des Durandus von Sancto Porciano im theologischen Armutsstreit. Eine Dominikanische Position in der Diskussion um die

franziskanische Armee (1332/3),” in *Vera Lex Historiae. Studien zu mittlalterlichen Quellen*, Festschrift für Dietrich Kurze (Köln, 1993): 149–196. In addition, see Kerry Spier’s, “Four manuscripts on evangelical poverty,” *Collectanea Franciscana* 59 (1989): 323–349 which touches upon the opinions of both Durandus and Natalis, as well as those of John of Naples.

90. *SOP*, 2, 586: “Vir fuit ingenii praestantia clarus, omni scientiarum genere excultus, tenacio memoriae, facili praeditus eloquio, quo mire ac feceliter mentis concepts exprimebat: sed qui tantus dotibus fretus privatis suis sensis nimium adhaesit. Unde relicta quam in scholis imbiberat S. Thomae doctrina, hoc fraino coerci non patiens, genis se totum permisit suo.”

91. Durandus, *Sentences*, 4 (Guerrea): “... naturalis Philosophia non est scire quid Aristoteles vel alii philosophi senserint, sed quid habeat veritas rerum. Unde ubi deviat mens Aristotelis a veritate rerum, non est scientia scire quid Aristoteles senserit, sed potius error.”

92. *Ibid.*, “Omnis homo dimittens rationem propter auctoritatem humanum incidit in insipientiam bestialiem.”

93. *Ibid.*, 3 “In his quae fidem tangunt, plus acquiescere debeamus auctoritati sacrae scripturae quam cuicumque rationi humanae.”

94. J. Koch, “Neue Aktenstiick ...”, 194.

95. C. K. Brampton, “Personalities at the process against Ockham at Avignon, 1324.–1326,” *Franciscan studies annual* 4 (1966): 4–25 and J. Koch, “Neue Aktenstiicke zu dem gegen Wilhelm Ockham in Avignon Geführten Prozess,” *RTAM* 7 (1935): 350–380; and *RTAM* 8 (1936): 79–93; 168–197.

96. See G. Cremascoli, “Il “Libellus de visione dei” di Durando di S. Porziano,” *Studi Medievali* 25 (1984): 393–443. For background, see Christine Trottman, “Vision béatifique et intuition d’un objet absent: des sources franciscaines du nominalisme aux défenseurs scotistes de l’opinion de Jean XXII sur la vision difféérée,” *Studi mediavali* 34 (1994): 653–715.

97. McLaughlin, *Intellectual Freedom*, 285.

98. Koch, “Die Magister-Jahre des Durandus de S. Porciano O.P.,” 16.

99. For example, as magister, Natalis was responsible for “presenting” his “formed” bachelors for the *licentia* and doctoral examinations. See Jacques Verger, “Teachers,” in *Universities in the Middle Ages*, 157. As a Dominican magister, Natalis was obligated by the general chapters to report regularly to his master general and to his provincial on the ability, work habits and doctrinal soundness of the friars under his charge. Reciprocally, Durandus would have been obliged to attend Natalis’ lectures and disputations.

100. Durandus of St. Pourçain, “Prologus,” *Sentences*: “Scripta super quatuor Sententiarum lib iuvenis inchoavi, sed senex complevi. ... Si autem in hoc opere aliquid digne laudabiliterque scriptum sit, illi soli sit laus et gloria, per quem munda data est gratia, et veritas patefacta. Si vero aliquid minus digne laudabiliterque scriptum sit, meae ascribatur imperitiae et non malitiae, quia studium meum semper fuit inquirere veritatem. Sed quia homo sum parvi ingenii et exigui temporis, non dubito, immo verissime praesumo, quod in dictis meis multa poterunt inveniri quae meliori iudicio poterunt corrigi et melius emendari, quod opto et oro fieri per talem qui sit veritatis amator et non aemulus reprehensor, ut tam opus meum quam correctio operis cedat ad honorem Ieus Christi, qui dicit, Ego sum veritas. ...”

101. Hervaeus Natalis, *Quodlibet* 1, q. 1, 70 (Zimmara): “Dico quod si a nullo intellectu intelligeretur, essent veri lapides veritate materiali et fundamentali. Sed eis non competeret veritas formalis excluso omni intellectu.” See also Timothy Fallon, “The notion of truth in Hervaeus Natalis,” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1966) for discussion.

102. A later version of the *quaestio* is contained in Durandus of St. Pourçain, *Quol. Paris I* (Q. I – Q.IV), ed. Takada.

103. Previous works consulted for this section are: Hester Goodenough Gelber, “Logic and the Trinity: a clash of values in scholastic thought, 1300–1335,” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1974): 43–58 and 106–129; Mark Henninger, “Some late medieval theories of the category of relation,” (PhD. Dissertation, UCLA, 1983): 200–214; Michael Schmaus, *Der liber propugnatorius des Thomas Anglicus und die Lehrunterschiede zwischen Thomas von Aquin und Duns Scotus*, BGPMA 29 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1930) and Rolf Schonberger, *Relation als Vergleich: Die Relationstheorie des Johannes Buridan im Kontext seines Denkens und der Scholastik*, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 43 (Leiden: Brill, 1994).

104. Courtenay, *Schools and scholars*, 191.

105. Cases in which bachelors openly dissented from the teachings of their masters seem to have been few and far between. See Jean Leclercq, “Lo sviluppo dell’atteggiamento critico degli allievi verso i maestri dal X al XIII secolo,” in *Università e società nei secoli XII–XVI, atti del non convegno internazionale di studio tenuto a Pistoia nei giorni 20–25 settembre 1979*, Pubblicazioni dell’Università cattolica del sacro cuore miscellanea del Centro di Studi medioevali 12 (Pistoia: Vita e pensiero, 1982). As a Friar Preacher appointed to St. Jacques by his provincial, Durandus would have faced more constraints

than did secular bachelors. Unlike his non-mendicant peers, he would not have had the choice (taken rarely even by seculars) of switching masters in the event of open conflict. Moreover, since he was one of the delegated students from the French province, he would not even have had the option of formally studying under the other Dominican regent master.

106. Decker, *Jakob von Metz*, 80–87.

107. Durandus of St. Pourçain, “Epilogus postremi scripti in libros I–IV Sententiarum,” in *Scriptum super IV libro Sententiarum*, Vat. Lat. 1074 (f. 147r): “... quod in primus dictaveram et scripseram, fuit a quibusdam curiosis mihi subreptum, antequam per me sufficienter correctum. ...”

108. Hervaeus Natalis, “Defensio,” Vat. Lat. 817 (f. 1r): “Reverendo ac spiritualis patri in Christo, fratri A., magistro ordinis predicatorum servus humilis et devotus filius frater herveus natalis eiusdem ordinis ...” and “Prologue,” in E. Krebs, *Theologie und Wissenschaft nach der Lehre der Hochscholastik. An Hand der bisher ungedruckten <<Defensa doctrinae S. Thomae>> de Hervaeus Natalis mit Beifügung gedruckter und gedruckter Parallelstellen*, BGPMA 11 (1912), 5 and *Opinio de difficultatibus*, 14: “Reverendo ac spiritualis patri in Christo, fratri A., magistro ordinis ... servus humilis et devotus filius ... opus super hoc a vobis impositum mihi propter reverentiam vestram et bonum obedientiae. ...”

109. *Acta*, 2, 39–40: “Concedimus tamen studentibus, qui sunt extra suas provincias nec commode pro huiusmodi licencia possunt ad suos provinciales recurrere, quod pro suis necessitatibus, si aliunde sibi providere non possint, libros suos, biblia dumtaxat et fratris Thome operibus exceptis, possint vendere de prioris sui, magistrorum, baccalareorum seu lectorum vel maioris partis consilio et assensu.”

110. *Ibid.*, 2, 38: “Volumus et districte iniungimus lectoribus et sublectoribus universis, quod legant et determinent secundum doctrinam et opera venerabilis doctoris fratris Thomae de Aquino, et in eadem scolares suos informant, et studentes in ea cum diligentia studere teneantur. Qui autem contrarium fecisse notabiliter inventi fuerint nec admoniti voluerint revocare, per priores provinciales vel magistrum Ordinis sic graviter et celeriter puniantur, quod sint ceteris in exemplum.”

111. In one of those circumstances leavened with irony, he incepted at the same time as Thomas of Wylton, a secular master who would remain at Paris until 1323 as one of Thomas’ staunchest defenders against Duns Scotus.

112. Glorieux, “Pro et contra Thomam. Un survol de cinquante années,” in *Sapientiae procerum amore*, 279.

113. Cited in F. Ehrle, “Nicolaus Trivet, sein Leben, sein Quolibet und Quaestiones Ordinariae,” BGPMA, Suppl. 2, 33, 5: “... iuxta id, quod circa huiusmodi est nobis impositum per Capitulum Generale, inhibemus districte lectoribus et sublectoribus universis, quod nullam conclusionem aliquam doctrine communi oppositam in scholis audeant asserere vel docere. Et ut istud melius observetur, volumus et imponimus, quod cum dictis scriptis et questionibus doctorum venerabilium fratrum Thome et Alberti et domini Petri de Tarantasia suas legant et continuent lectiones ...”

114. *Acta*, 2, 64: “Cum doctrina venerabilis doctoris fratris Thomae de Aquino sanior et communior reputetur, et eam Ordo noster specialiter prosequi teneatur, inhibemus districte quod nullus frater legendo, determinando, respondendo, audeat assertive tenere contrarium eius quod communiter creditur de opinione doctoris praedicti, nec recitare aut confirmare aliquam singularem opinionem contra communem doctorum sententiam in his, quae ad fidem vel mores pertinere noscuntur, nisi reprobando et statim obiectionibus respondendo. Quicumque autem per provincialem vel eius vicarium, qui super hiis inquirere teneantur, ex certa sciencia in aliquo premissorum inventus fuerit deliquisse, per eosdem, cum eis legitime constiterit, a lectoratus officio vel studio absolvantur in penam: si tamen alias de huiusmodi sit notatus.”

115. *Ibid.*, 2, 65: “Nullus etiam ad studium Parisiense mittatur, nisi in doctrina Fratris Thome saltem tribus annis studuerit diligenter.”

116. *Ibid.*, 2, 65: “Inhibemus districte, ne scripta, tractatus, compilationes, reportationes quaestionum quarumcumque a fratribus nostris edita vel edenda extra Ordinem publicentur, quousque per venerabilem patrem magistrum Ordinis examinata fuerint et correcta; communicata vero extra Ordinem per eundem examinari et corrigi volumus diligenter.”

117. Glorieux, “Pro et contra Thomam,” 280.

118. This process was first used in the censure of John Peter Olivi in 1285. Kock, “Die Verteilung Olivis auf dem Konzil von Vienne und ihre Vorgeschichte,” *Scholastik*, 5 (1930), 498 and David Burr, “Olivi and the limits of intellectual freedom,” 188.

119. The following narration of the events related to the investigation process has been drawn from J.M.M.H. Thijssen, *Censure and heresy at the University of Paris, 1200–1400*, The Middle Ages series (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998).

120. Koch, *Kleine Schriften*, 2: 53 and 206.

121. *Reprobationes excusationum Durandi* in Martin, *La Controverse*, 390: “Quantum autem ad hoc

quod dicit, quod verba sua sint accepta insidiose, perverse, et captiose, etsi qua sint similia, quantum est de certissime assero, de aliis autem, quod nullus fuit ibi qui vellet sic accipere verba cuiuscumque doctoris; et deinde dico, quod vellem quod nihil reprehensibile esset in dictis suis.”

122. Koch, “Durandus de Sancto Porciano, O.P.,” 225–226.

123. *Acta*, 2, 72: “Cum circa reformationem studii cura. ... Qui statim post pascha incipiat legere de philosophia morali vel de aliquo tractatu fratris Thome vel alternatim de istis et continuet saltem usque ad kalendas augusti. Ad cuius lectiones omnes studentes teneantur venire.”

124. *Ibid.*, 2, 81. “Magister studencium observabit et referet magistro ordinis in studiis generalibus et provinciali et diffinitoribus in aliis studiis, quid, quantum et quomodo lectores legent et in anno quociens disputabunt. Insuper si docuerint contra communem doctrinam Thome aut contra communes opiniones ecclesie, tangentes articulos fidei, bonos mores vel ecclesie sacramenta, aut si contra ista, aut aliquid istorum adduxerint rationes, quas dimiserint insolutas. Super quibus eos primo cum debita reverentia admonabit; quod si se non correxerint debite revocando, provinciali vel eius vicario referat verbo vel scripto, si magister ordinis non fuerit in proinquo; qui si invenerit ita esse, eos absolvat ab officio lectionum.”

125. *Ibid.*, 2, 81. “Advertat etiam magister studencium, si aliquid contra doctrinam aut erroneam vel suspectum seu errori propinquum invenerit in scriptis vel reportationibus quibuscumque. Quod si aliquid tale suo iudicio poterit invenire, statim significare magistro ordini non obmittat. Ad quod faciendum lectores et cursores studiorum generalium necnon et alii fratres ad hoc apti maneant obligati.”

126. *Ibid.*, 2, 83–84; A. Walz, “Ordinationes capitulorum generalium de Sancto Thoma eiusque cultu et doctrina,” *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum* 31 (1923): 172. For the Dominican library at Padua, see L. Gargan, *Lo Studio teologico e la Biblioteca dei Domenicani a Padova nel Tre e Quattrocento* (Padua: Antenore, 1971).

127. *CUP*, 2, 174: “Quia frater Albertus Guidi, bacellarius Florentinus, hoc anno in conventu Florentino dum disputaretur de Quolibet in conspectu multitudinis fratrum. Secularium, clericorum et aliorum religiosorum temerarie, non solum in ipsa disputatione, sed etiam in cathedra dum legeret, multa assertive dixit contra sanam et sacram doctrinam venerabilis doctoris fratris Thome de Aquino ... imponimus ac districte mandamus eidem fratri Uberto ... quando reverendus pater prior provincialis sibi duxerit imponendum, et ipsum per biennium omni lectione omnique disputatione cuiuscumque facultatis ac magisterio studentium et omni actu scolastico privamus. Et ipsum de conventu Florentino removemus et Pistoriensi conventui assignamus et decem dies in pane et aqua jejunandos sibi damus.”

128. *Documenta*, Laurent, 662, no. 52.

129. Konstanty Michalski, “La révocation par Frère Barthélemy, en 1316, de theses incriminées,” in *Aus der Geisteswelt des Mittelalters*, Festgabe M. Grabmann, BGPM, suppl. 3 (1935): 1091–1098.

130. *Acta*, 2, 93: “Item cum quidam tractatus scripta sive reportaciones theologie a fratribus nostri ordinis compilati, sine examinatione et approbatione ordinis contra constitutiones publicati, fratres a communi et salubri doctrina retrahant, et possint saltem simplicibus dare occasionem errandi, volumus et ordinamus, quod priores provinciales in suis capitulis provincialibus de consilio diffinitorum studeant de tali remedio providere, quod huic defectui salubriter obvietur, dictumque remedium quam cito poterunt, studeant magistro ordinis intimare et ipse videat, si circa tale remedium sit aliquid immutandum.”

131. *Ibid.*: “Magistro etiam ordinis imponimus, quod examen de mandato suo factum ex ordinatione generalis capituli Metis novissime celebrati de predictis tractatibus, reportacionibus, sive scriptis executioni mandet, secundum quod in presenti diffinitorio concorditer est conclusum.”

132. *Acta*, 2, 303; *CUP*, 2, 614.

133. *Catalogus Pragensis*, in *Institutum Hist. FF. Praed. Dissertationes Historicae* II, 99: “Frater Durandellus, magister in theologia. Scripsit solemne scriptum contra Durandum, sive contra corruptorem, reprobandus positiones eius quas ponit contra sanctum Thomam, ex dictis sancti Thomae, et ex iisdem solvit omnia argumenta quae Durandus fecit contra sanctum Thomam, et vocatur Corruptorium corruptorii. Incipit vero: ‘Sedens adversus fratrem tuum loquebaris et adversus filium matris tuae ponebas scandalum; haec fecisti et tacui. Existimasti inique etc.’”

134. Grabmann, *Forschungen*, MG., 1: 392–404. See also Gilson, *History of Christian philosophy*, 746.

135. Magister Hugo, *Litt. Encycl.*, no. 82, 254 and 257: “... ad indefense insistendum studio sapientiae et doctrinae S. Thomae.” and “Solide doctrine sancti Thome insistite, opiniones futuras divinitate.”

136. Toussaint Duplessis, O.S.B., *Histoire de l’église de Meaux* (Paris, 1731), 1: 258, cited in Feret, “Durand de Saint-Pourçain,” 16.

137. Courtenay, *Schools & Scholars*, 182.

138. *Œuvres de Gerson*, 1706, t. I, 559 cited in Feret, 37: “Juvant quaestiones Doctorum super Sententias, et praesertim illorum qui purius et solidius conscripserunt, inter quales meo iudicio dominus Altissiodorensis, Bonaventura et Durandus utique resolutissimus numerandi videntur.”

139. For instance, *Cat. Stams*, MOPH 18, 63. “Fr. Ervergius, natione Brito, magister in theologia, scripsit lecturam super sententias; item duo quodlibet; item contra Henricum de Gaude ubi impugnat Thomam: item de verbo, item quaestiones de peccato originali.”

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1. Most bothersome to contemporary Thomists has been Natalis' rejection of the distinction between essence and existence which was first noted in Barthélemy Hauréau, *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique* (Paris: Durand et Pedone-Laureil, 1880), 2nd partie, Tom. 2², 328. More recently, Natalis' position on the real distinction has been discussed in Elliot B. Allen, "Hervaeus Natalis," *Medieval Studies* 22 (1960), 3; and Władysław Świątko, "Les opinions d'Hervé Nédellec au sujet de l'essence et l'existence," *MPP* 10 (1961): 59–74. However, not all scholars share this complaint. For example, Martin Grabmann extolls Natalis' fidelity to Thomas in his *Die Lehre des hl Thomas von Aquin*, 33–35.

2. For the two Dominicans' disputes over original sin, see Introduction, 5, nn. 3 and 4.

3. Knowles, *Evolution*, 315. Among the seminal histories of scholasticism, Michalski sees Durandus as being part of the growing trend towards scepticism. Konstanty Michalski, "Les courants philosophiques à Oxford et à Paris pendant le XIV^e siècle," in his *La philosophie au XIV^e siècle: six études*, ed. Kurt Flasch, *Opuscula philosophica: Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte*, 1 (Frankfurt: Minerva, 1969): 17–19. Gilson, *History of Christian philosophy*: 474–476, is in accord but adds the third area of the noetic.

4. Schonberger, *Relation als Vergleich*, 103–122. See also Ruedi Imbach, "L'antithomisme de Thierry de Freiberg," *Revue thomiste* 97 (1997): 245–258.

5. Gordon Leff, *Medieval thought: St. Augustine to Ockham* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1958): 275–276.

6. Mark Henninger, *Relations: medieval theories 1250–1325* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989); Evan Brover Jeffry, "Medieval theories of relations before Aquinas: categories commentaries A.S. 510–1250," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1996); A. Krempel, *La doctrine de la relation chez Saint Thomas: exposé historique et systématique* (Paris: Vrin, 1952); and Julius Weinberg, "The concept of relation: some observations on its history," in his *Abstraction, relation, and induction: three essays in the history of thought* (Madison & Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965): 61–119.

7. Knowles, *Evolution*, 315.

8. Weinberg, *Abstraction*, 86.

9. Joseph Owens, *An elementary Christian metaphysics* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1963): 179–290; and B. Mattingly, "Relation," *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 12 (1967): 216–220.

10. Koch, Durandus, 193: "Das wichtigste problem der Metaphysik ist für Durandus das Problem der Relation.," idem, "Praefatio," in Durandus of St. Pourçain, *Tractatus de Habitibus: Quaestio quarta*, ed. idem., *Opuscula et textus: historiam ecclesiae eiusque vitam atque doctrinam illustratia*, Series scholastica, 9 (Monasterii: Aschendorff, 1930), 5: "Attamen haec quaestio tempore Durandi tam a philosophis quam a theologis crebro agebatur, quia in ea, quam vim principia habeant, apparet."

11. Durandus' modalism has been traced back to James of Metz, and through him, ultimately from Henry of Ghent, influenced somewhat, perhaps, by his contemporary, Peter of Aureole. For discussion, see Jean Paulus, *Henri de Gand: essai sur les tendances de sa métaphysique*, Études de philosophie médiévale, 25 (Paris: Vrin, 1938): 187–191. Paulus claims an intellectual kinship between Durandus, James of Metz and Henry of Ghent. In contrast, Gilson, *Christian Philosophy*, 774–775, follows Koch in grouping together the triad of Durandus, James of Metz and Peter of Aureole. It should be noted, however, that these ideological affiliations are, to some extent, generalizations artificially constructed by scholars. In reality, Durandus' thought did contain many Thomistic elements. Reciprocally, Natalis was influenced, in different areas, by Henry of Ghent and Duns Scotus.

12. Koch, "Jakob von Metz," 177.

13. The third redaction of Durandus' *Commentaria in IV libros Sententiarum* will be used in this section. Although the terminology Durandus employed to discuss his theory of relations had changed from that which he had used in the first redaction, the contents of his arguments was substantially the same. See Henninger, "Some late medieval theories," 229, ff. 70 and 73.

14. Leff, *Medieval thought*, 277.

15. Durandus, I, d. 30, l. 2, n. 14, 84 (Guerraëa): "Relatio in creaturis realiter differt a suo fundamento, non facit compositionem cum fundamento." and *Quol. Par.* I, 1: "In contrarium est, quia relatio et suum fundamentum differunt realiter, cum sint diversa praedicamenta; nec tamen faciunt compositionem, quia sicut relatio advenit alicui de novo sine sui mutatione, ut dicitur 5 Physicorum, ita sine compositione, ut videtur."

16. Leff, *Medieval thought*, 276.

17. I, d. 30, q. 2, 84 va. (Guerraëa): "Quantum ad primum sunt duae opiniones."

18. Decker, *Jakob von Metz*, 437. This is particularly true of Durandus' writings on the real distinction between the relations and essence of the Persons of the Trinity.

19. Hervaeus Natalis, *De relatione contra Durandum*, ed. Takeshiro Takada, Series of hitherto unedited texts of medieval thinkers, 3 (Kyoto: s.p., 1966) was written in reply to Durandus' *Quodlibetal Parisiense* I, q. 2. See also Durandus of St. Pourçain, *Quol. Paris I (Q. I-Q. IV)*, ed. Takeshiro Takada, Series of hitherto unedited texts of medieval thinkers, 4 (Kyoto: Doshisha Daigaku Bunkagakakai, Doshisha University, 1968).

20. Natalis, I, 29, q. 1, a. 1, 125 (Moreau): "Secunda opinio dicit quod relatio secundum suam quidditatem non dicit aliquam rem aliam a fundamento, sed dicit modum realem diversum realiter a fundamento. Et ista positio quantum ad hoc, quod relatio non addit aliam rem a fundamento facientem compositionem cum eo, innititur rationi supradicte." Not surprisingly, this is an objection to which Durandus would later reply, *Quod. Par. I*, 5: "Est ergo intentio istorum, quod relatio differt realiter a suo fundamento, et facit cum eo compositionem, et nihilominus potest alicui advenire ex alterius mutatione. Istam opinionem non credo esse veram, maxime quantum ad hoc quod dicit, quod relatio facit compositionem cum suo fundamento, et quod potest advenire alicui ex alterius mutatione."

21. Hervaeus Natalis, *Contra 1 Sent. Durandi*, d. 12, q. 1; Munique Clm. 13 383, fol. 94 vb. in Schmaus, 327: "Falsum autem continet et supponit, scilicet quod creaturis relatio dicat modum differentem re a fundamento, et non dicat rem aliam a fundamento, quia tam in divinis quam in creaturis dicere aliqua posita differre realiter, et non dicere diversas res, est contradicere. ..."

22. Natalis often turned to Augustine's texts to refute arguments which Durandus had founded on the Bishop of Hippo's authority. For instance, see *De relatione contra Durandum*: 11–12: "Item hoc idem arguitur auctoritate Augustini sic: quia illud, quod non dicit de Deo nisi novam appellationem, non videtur esse in Deo realiter, sed secundum rationem tantum. Sed secundum Augustinum relationes, que sunt in Deo ex tempore, non dicunt nisi quandam appellationem de Deo ex tempore."

23. M-Dom. Philippe, "Les processions divines selon Durand de Saint-Pourçain," *RT* 47 (1947): 244–288. See also Giles Emery, "La théologie trinitaire des Evidentie contra Durandum Durandellus," *RT* (1997), 175. In some ways, Durandus was merely expanding the earlier teachings of James of Metz. See Koch, "Jakob von Metz," 166.

24. *Quod. Par. I*, 41: "Quod in patre differant realiter paternitas et spiratio, non solum ponunt aliqui antiqui et moderni doctores, sed etiam doctor communis beatus Thomas videtur hoc posuisse, aliquin argumentum suum, quo probat quod Spiritus sanctus non distingueretur a filio, si non procederet ab eo, non valeret."

25. *Correctiones*, 318: "..., dicendum quod maior est falsa, scilicet quod duae relationes in Patre sunt duae res. Quod, autem, nituntur hoc probare per fratrem Thomam, mirabile est, cum ipse ex intentione determinet oppositum. Probatio, autem, parum valet, quando dicitur quod frater Thomas dicat eas esse disparatas, quia cum disparatio possit esse in rationibus vel in rebus, procedere a disparatione communiter dicta ad alteram, est materiata fallacia consequentis."

26. I, d. 11, q. 3 (Guerraerae): "Tenent omnes quod pater et filius sunt duo supposita: quae per unam et eandem vim spirativam spirant spiritum sanctum. ..." Aquinas tended to use the term '*processio*' whereas Durandus preferred those of '*emanatio*' and '*spiratio*'

27. I, d. 6, q. 2 (Ibid.): "... prima emanatio est secundum intellectum, alia autem sequens in qua terminatur emanatio manens infra naturam intellectualem, est emanatio pertinens ad voluntatem."

28. Hervaeus Natalis, "Correctiones supra dicta Durandi de Sancto Porciano in Primo Quolibet," in Durandus of Saint Pourçain, *Quolibeta Avenionensia Tria, additis Correctionibus Hervei Natalis supra dicta Durandi in Primo Quolibet*, ed. Prospero T. Stella, Textus et studia in historiam scholasticae, 1 (Zürich: Bas-Verglag, 1965): 309–310; and idem., "Die gegen Durandus gerichtete Streitschrift des Herveus Natalis << De articulis pertinentibus ad primum Sententiarum Durandi >> (Art. 1–5)," ed. Takeshiro Takada in *Sapientiae procerum amore*, 439–456.

29. *De articulis*, 443: "Tertius articulus, quem ponit d. 7 q. unica....Quod in generatione divina principium productionis est relatio, et similiter terminus productionis est relatio producta. Principium autem communicandi et terminus communicatus est essentia divina."

30. *Ibid.*, 450. "Ad hoc sciendum est, quod ipse mota quaestione de prioritate et ordine, quia secundum ipsum inter duas emanationes sc. generationem et spirationem non est ordo per se originans, quo 'hoc est ex hoc', ita sc. quod per se nec spirare a generare vel generari nec etiam spirari nec spiratus est per se a generante vel generato."

31. Emery, "La théologie trinitaire," 173–218.

32. Durandus, *Excusationes*, cited in Koch, *Durandus*, 87: "Quantum autem ad secundum principale sciendum, quod modus, quo volunt quidam excusare dicta sua diversa de habitudine essencie divine ad relationes et personas, est, quod dicunt se non dixisse simpliciter essenciam differre a relationibus et

personis, sed alio modo, quia non sunt eadem convertibiliter [113ra] adequate, dicentes omnem errorem excludi a dictis suis per hanc expositionem.”

33. I Sent. 33, 1 (Guerraëa): “Ista opinio si esset vera, evitaret multas difficultates circa distinctionem personarum.”

34. Gelber, “Logic and the Trinity,” 43.

35. Bernard McGinn, “The Trinity in history,” in *Calabrian Abbot*, 161–204; Harold Lee, “The anti-Lombard figures of Joachim of Fiore: a reinterpretation [figures of the Trinity],” in *Prophecy and millenarianism*, ed. Ann Williams (Essex: Longman, 1980): 129–142; G. Di Napoli, “Gioacchino da Fiore e Pietro Lombardo,” *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scholastica* 71 (1979): 621–685; and Fiona Robb, “The Fourth Lateran Council’s definition of Trinitarian Orthodoxy,” *Journal of ecclesiastical history* 48 (1997): 22–43.

36. Lee, “Anti-Lombard figures,” 134.

37. Decretals of Gregory IX, cited in Di Napoli, “Gioacchino da Fiore,” 647: “Damnamus ergo et reprobamus libellum seu tractatum, quem Abbas Ioachim edidit contra Magistrum Petrum Lombardum, de unitate seu essentia Trinitatis, appellans ipsum haereticum et insanum pro eo, quod in suis dixit Sententiis: Quoniam quaedam summa res est Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus, et illa non est generans, neque genita, neque procedens.”

38. McGinn, “The Trinity in history,” 167.

39. This theme runs throughout all of the relevant questions contained in Durandus’ Parisian and Avignonese quodlibets.

40. *Quol. Aven.* I, 58–59: “Ad tertium rationem, dicendum est quod in illa Decretali <<Damnamus>>, reprobat et condemnatur opinio Joachim quantum ad duo, quorum unum ipse ponebat, et aliud imponebat Magistro Sententiarum. Joachim, enim, sicut verissimus arianus, ponebat quod Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, non sunt unum in essentia et natura, nisi collective, sicut multi homines sunt unus populus, et multi fideles una ecclesia; quod nitebatur probare per multas auctoritates Sacrae Scripturae, ut patet clare intuenti textum illius Decretalis.”

41. I, 33, q. 1, 91ra (Guerraëa): “Et qui negant hoc, videntur clare incidere in haeresim sabellianam, quia impossibile est salvare quod paternitas et filiatio differant realiter inter se et non differant ab essentia ex natura rei, et sic realiter ...”

42. *Quol. Par.* I, 45: “Et hoc modo necesse est dicere, quod essentia divina et relatio differant, nisi velimus clare incidere in talem haeresim Sabellianam.”

43. *Quol. Aven.* I, 59: “Item, imponebat Magistro sententiarum, quod ipse ponebat quaternitatem, quia dicebat Patrem generantem, et Filium genitum, et Spiritum Sanctum procedentem, et cum hoc dicebat essentiam divinam esse quamdam summam rem non generantem, nec genitam, nec procedentem. Et ita, ut recitat Decretalis, dicebat quod Magister Petrus, non solum trinitatem, sed etiam quaternitatem astruebat in Deo videlicet tres personas et illam communem essentiam, quasi quartam. ...”

44. Natalis, *Correctiones*, 318: “Ad secundum, dicendum quod maior est falsa, scilicet quod duae relationes in Patre sunt duae res. Quod, autem, nituntur hoc probare per fratrem Thomam, mirabile est, cum ipse ex intentione determinet oppositum. Probatio, autem, parum valet, quando dicitur quod frater Thomas dicat eas esse disparatas, quia cum disparatio possit esse in rationibus vel in rebus, procedere a disparatione communiter dicta ad alteram, est materiata fallacia consequentis.”

45. *Ibid.*, 320. “Quod, autem, subdit ibidem, quod nisi ponatur talis distinctio realis inter es, inciditur in errorem Sabellii, dico quod falsum est. Quia ad non incidendum in errorem Sabellii, sufficit, quod salvatur quod una persona differat realiter ab alia inter se. Ad hoc, autem non requiritur quod essentia et relatio differant realiter, sed sufficit identitas non convertibilis, sicut frequenter patuit.”

46. *Ibid.*, 322. “Sed, secundum istum, nulla relatio est res. Ergo nulla distinctio, quae est solum secundum relationem, est distinctio rei a re. Ergo, in divinis, nulla est distinctio rei a re. Quod non est verum dictum, nec ut videtur sane.”

47. *Ibid.*, 306: “Unde, si talis ratio esset insolubilis, nobis imputare debemus defectum nostrae ignorantiae, potius quam defectum veritati.”

48. *Ibid.*, 300–301: “... licet ut teneo ista sit sententia Concilii generalis, contra tamen obiciuntur multa, quae vel vix vel simpliciter non possunt solvi a viatore solutione satisfaciente, vel satisfaciendo intellectui, non propter defectum veritatis rei, quia videns nude Trinitatem solveret plene omni, sed propter invidentiam huius veritatis, quam viatores habent.”

49. Koch, *Kleine Schriftum*, 55: “D. 13, 1. Unica...In eadem d. q. unica circa finem positionis dicit, quod generare et spirare in patre realiter differunt et similiter generari et spirare in filio et quod in eodem supposito sunt plura, quae realiter differunt; et prius in solutione ad tertium argumentum primo opinionis in secundo articulo positionis dixerat, quod essentia ponit in numerum rerum cum relationibus, et eadem questione quod essentia et relatio differunt realiter. *Totum hereticum reputamus.*”

50. *Ibid.*: 56–57: “D. 33 q. prima probat per multas rationes, ad quas non respondet, quod essentia

divina et relatio different realiter, et respondet ad quendam que contra hoc adducit et communiter ab aliis adducuntur ... sicut supra notatum est in sexto articulo; et dicit quod non omne illud quod non est essentia divina est creatura, quia relatio divina nec est essentia divina nec creatura.”

51. *Ibid.*, 73: “[9] D. 7 a. 1 ... Contra communem doctrinam et ecclesie in secunda Decretali >>Dampnamus<< et contra Thomam p. I q. 28 a. 2 et q. disp. 38⁴ a. 2, ubi dicit, quod dicere oppositum est hereticum; et hoc idem dicit magister d. 33 primi Sent.a.I.”

52. *Ibid.*, 74: “[14] D. 13 a. I dicit et nititur probare multipliciter, quod generare et spirare in patre differunt realiter, et generari et spirare in filio, ut relationes disparate existentes in eadem persona; et <eciam> essentia et relatio; ... Contra doctrinam communem et ecclesie, ut patet ex secunda Decretali⁷, et sanctorum omnium qui ponunt in divinis solum ternarium rerum, et quod sola oppositio relativa distinguit realiter in divinis, et contra Thomam ubique, ut patet supra a. 9, et quere ibi.”

53. See especially Katherine Tachau, *Vision and certitude in the age of Ockham: optics, epistemology and the foundations of semantics, 1250–1345*, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters (Leiden: Brill, 1988). Other works consulted for scholastic views on epistemology and cognition during the early fourteenth century included: Sebastian Day, *Intuitive cognition: a key to the significance of the later scholastics*, Franciscan Institute Publications, philosophy series 4 (St. Bonaventure, N.Y.: Franciscan Institute, 1947); Robert Pasnau, *Theories of cognition in the later middle ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); and Martin Tweedale, “Mental representations in later medieval scholasticism,” in *Historical foundations of cognitive science*, ed. J. C. Smith, Philosophical studies series, 46 (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1989): 35–52.

54. Koch, “Jakob von Metz,” 143 and Leen Spruit, *Species intelligibilis: from perception to knowledge*, Brill’s studies in intellectual history 49 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 247.

55. For an overview of Natalis’ theory of knowledge, see P. Stella, “Il “*De intellectus et species*” del cosiddetto “*De Quattuor Materialiis*,” *Salesianum* 21 (1959): 1–70. See also Patrizia Conforti, “Hervé de Nédellec et les questions ordinaires *De cognitione primi principii*,” *RT* 97 (1997): 63–82; Joseph Santeler, *Der kausale Gottesbeweis bei Hervé Ntalis: nach dem ungedruckten Traktat de cognitione primi principii*, Philosophie und Grenzwissenschaften 3 (Innsbruck: Felizian Rauch, 1930) and Ruth G. Wengert, “Three senses of intuitive cognition: a quodlibetal question of Harvey of Nédellec,” *Franciscan Notes to Studies* 43:12 (1983): 408–431.

56. There are a number of parallels between the cognitive theories of Henry and Durandus. For example, Henry had also denied intelligible species. See Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy*, 452.

57. I Sent., d. 27, q. 2 (Guerraera).

58. Durandus of St. Pourçain, “Quaestio de natura cognitionis (II Sent. [A] d. 3 q. 5); et “Disputatio cum Anonymo quodam,” *Opuscula et textus*, fasc. 6, ed. Joseph Koch (Monasterii: Aschendorff, 1935). *Disputationes Durandi et anonymi cuiusdam*, ed. Joseph Koch and Takeshiro Takada, Series of hitherto unedited texts of medieval philosophy, 2 (Kyoto: [s.p.], 1965).

59. I, Sent. D. 3, q. 5, f. 27ra. (Guerraera): “Potentie innotescunt per actus ... ideo si necessarium est ponere intellectum agentem, hoc erit propter aliquam operationem eius necessariam ad actum intelligendi, operatio autem intellectus agentis non potest intelligi nisi in phantasmata, vel nisi [sic] intellectum possibilem, sed nec in fantasmata nec in intellectum possibilem habet aliquam actionem ut declarabitur, ergo fictitium est ponere intellectum agentem.”

60. ST I, q. 85, a. 2: “... similitudo rei intellectae quae est species intelligibilis, est forma secundum quam intellectus intelligit.”

61. Durandus’ “Quaestio de natura cognitionis,” ed. Koch, 7. “Videnda sunt duo, primum est qualiter fiat intelligere in nobis per speciem vel absque specie ... duplex est opinio. Prima dicit quod intelligere est actio intellectus informati specie rei intelligibilis realiter ab utroque differens, ad quam se habet intellectus specie informati sicut aqua facta calida ad calefactionem pedum vel specie informati sicut aqua facta calida ad calefactionem pedum vel manus ... species est forma et actus intellectus per quam factus in actu potest elicere actum intelligendi. Ergo verius causatur nostrum intelligere a specie quam ab intellectu, immo plus, quia licet totum compositum ex intellectu et specie sit illud quod agit vel elicit actum intelligendi sola tamen species est principium quo et nullo modo intellectus. ...

62. I, d. 3, q. 5, 27ra. (Guerraera): “Universale, id est, ratio vel intentio universalitas aut res sub intentione universalitatis non est primum obiectum intellectus nec praexistit intellectioni, sed aliud formatum per operationem intelligendi. ...”

63. II Sent. d. 3, q. 7 (Guerraera).

64. Durandus, *Quaestio de natura cog.*, 18: “... quod sentire et intelligere non dicunt aliquid reale additum super sensum et intellectum, faciens cum eis realem compositionem; et ulterius, quod tales actus sunt in nobis per se dante sensum et intellectum quod est creans et generans, ab obiecto autem sicut a causa sine qua non. ...”

65. Fumagalli, *Durando di S. Porziano. Elementi filosofici della terza redazione del "Commento alle Sentenze"*... ("Firenze: La nuova Italia Edictrice, 1969), 74. Here she is explicitly referring to Durandus' discussion on intelligible species as it is contained in his III Sent. d. 3, q. 6.

66. Hervaeus Natalis, *De Speciebus*, 302: "... videtur mihi quo possit probabiliter teneri quod in intellectu sit aliqua species intelligibilis diversa ab actu intelligendi. Hoc autem probabiliter potest persuaderi et ratione et auctoritate."

67. Indeed, Durandus was cognizant that his theories in this area were not commonly held. I, d. 3, q. 5 (Guerraera): "... quod non ponitur communiter."

68. Natalis reversed his earlier position and rejected the need for intelligible species in his *Quodlibet* II, q. 8 and *Quodlibet* III, q. 8. For a discussion, see Spruitt, *Species Intelligibles*, 271.

69. II Sent. d. 3, q. 6 (Guerraera): "Et quod non sit ponere speciem in sensu, puta in visu ad repraesentandum visui colorem ut videatur, patet sic, omne illud per quod tanquam per repraesentativum potentia cognitiva fertur in alterum est primo cognitum. Sed species coloris in oculo non est primo, seu visa ab ipso, imo nullo modo est visa ab eo, ergo per ipsam tanquam per repraesentativum visus, non fertur in aliquid aliud..."

70. II. Sent. d. 3 q. 6 (Guerraera): "Et sine dubio de se videtur absurdum quod potentia cognitiva ducatur in cognitionem alicuius per tale repraesentativum quod est sibi totaliter incognitum. Contrarium enim verissimum est, videlicet quod per notum ducitur in cognitionem ignoti..."

71. Michalski, *La philosophie au XIV^e siècle*: 50–52.

72. See Francis Kelley, "Some observations on Ockham's *factum* theory and *esse objectivum* in Hervaeus Natalis," *Franciscan Studies* 38 (1978), 269.

73. For example, Natalis' II Sent d. 17 a. 3 is specifically concerned with refuting Durandus' repudiation of the agent intellect.

74. *De articulis*, 442: "Secundus articulus, quem ponit d. 3 q. ultima primo articulo ..., quod non est certum, quod intellectus agens sit supremum inter partes animae vel etiam quod intellectus agens sit, quia etiam de hoc nihil dicit Augustinus."

75. *Ibid.*, 440: "Sed actus intelligendi est nobilior simpliciter omni qualitate corporali et omni phantasia et omni cognitione sensitiva. Ergo in omni cognitione necessario oportet dare aliquod principium activum praeter praemissa ad reducendum intellectum possibilem in actum intelligendi. Sed tale principium est vocatur communiter intellectus agens."

76. *Ibid.*, 102–107: "Secundum autem falsam imaginationem ipsius, qui ponit, quod actus intelligendi non dicit aliquid superadditum intellectui possibili, sed est sola relatio eius ad obiectum noviter productum et praesentatum, non esset necessarium intellectum agentem..."

77. I. Sent. D. 3, q. 2 (Guerraera): "Si quis autem circa hoc, salva fide, melius scit dicere, hoc mihi placitum erit."

78. Leff, *Medieval thought*, 259.

79. Conforti, "Hervé de Nédellec," 63.

80. Henninger, *Relations*, 178.

81. The following works were consulted for this section: Stephen F. Brown, "Peter of Candia's hundred-year "History" of the theologian's role," *Medieval philosophy & theology* 1 (1991): 156–190; B. P. Gaybba, *Aspects of the mediaeval history of theology: 12th to 14th centuries*, Studia originalia 7 (Pretoria: University of South Africa Press, 1988); Paul de Vooght, *Les sources de la doctrine Chrétienne: d'après les théologiens du XIV^e du début du XV^e avec le texte intégral des XII premières questions de la Summa inédite de Gérard de Bologne (†1317)* (Paris: Brouwer, 1953).

82. For previous treatments of Durandus' concept of theology, see Maria Theresa Beonio Brocchieri Fumagalli, *Durando di S. Porziano. Elementi filosofici della terza redazione del "Commento alle Sentenze"* (Firenze: La nuova Italia Edictrice, 1969): 1–52; *idem.*, "Note sul concetto di teologia in Durando di S. Porziano," in *Filosofia e teologia nel trecento: Studi in ricordo di Eugenio Randi*, ed. Luca Bianchi, Textes et Études du Moyen Age (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1994): 57–64; and Johannes von Beumer, "Schriftthologie in Theorie und Praxis: Nach dem Sentenzekommentar des Durandus a Sancto Porciano, O.P.," *Scholastik* 40 (1965): 235–240. Edward A. Synan, "Sensibility and science in medieval theology: the witness of Durandus of St. Pourçain and Denis the Carthusian," in *Knowledge and the sciences in medieval philosophy: proceedings of the 8th International Congress of Medieval Philosophy (S.I.P.E.M.)*, Helsinki 24–29 August 1987, Acta philosophica Fennica (Helsinki: Finnish Society for Missiology and Ecumenics, 1990): 531–539.

83. For Durandus, our information is limited to what is contained in the prologue to his *Comentaria in IV libros Sententiarum*. Natalis' answered Durandus' critique of Thomas' position in two of his major works: the prologue to his own commentary and his *Defensio doctrinae divi Thomae*, which was written sometime between 1307 and 1308. See Hervaeus Natalis, "Defensa doctrina Divi Thomae," in *Theologie*

und Wissenschaft: 1–114. For an abstract of Kreb's edition, see M. Jacquin, "Bulletin d'histoire des doctrines Chrétiennes," *RSPT* 7 (1931), 352. Another version of the *Defensa* is available in idem., "Opinio de difficultatibus contra doctrinam fratris Thome," ed. Paolo Piccari in *Disputa theologica devotio et utopia* (sec. XIV–XVI), *Memorie Domenicane*, ns. 26 (1995): 5–193. Hereafter cited as *Opinio*. Scholars have given disparate interpretations of the work's primary purpose. An early consideration of this discussion is available in A. Beilmeier, "Die Stellungnahme des Hervaeus Natalis, O.P., (1323) in der Frage nach dem Wissenschaftscharakter der Theologie," *Divus Thomas* 3 (1925): 399–414. However, the contemporary consensus is that the work was a refutation of Scotus' and Durandus' attacks on Aquinas' concept of theology. More specifically, articles 6, 9, and 16–22 of Natalis' *Defensa* were directed against Durandus. See also Johannes Beumer, "Schriftlose Theologie?," 398–404.

84. Marie-Dominique Chenu, *La théologie comme science XII^e siècle*, *Bibliographic Thomiste* 33 (1957); Camillo Dumont, *La thologie comme science chez scolastiques du treizième siècle: histoire de la question <<Utrum theologia sit scientia>> de 1230 à 1320* (Louvain: 1962); and Jean LeClercq, "La théologie comme science dans la littérature quodlibétique," *RTAM* 11 (1939): 351–374.

85. Brian Davies, "Is *sacra doctrina* theology?" *New Blackfriars* 71 (1990): 141–147.

86. The term *scientia* was highly nuanced, its meaning varying subtly from thinker to thinker. For an overall discussion, see Eileen Serene, "Demonstrative Science," *CHLMP*, 496–518.

87. Stephen F. Brown, "Henry of Ghent's 'De reductione artium ad theologiam,'" 194–206; and idem., "Henry of Ghent's critique of Aquinas' subalternation theory and the early Thomistic response," in *Knowledge and the sciences*: 337–345 and Armand A. Maurer, "The unity of a science: St. Thomas and the nominalists," in *Comm. St.*, 2: 269–292.

88. Jean-Pierre Torrell, "Le savoir théologique chez les premiers thomistes," *RT* 97 (1997): 9–30.

89. Theodor W. Kohler, "Wissenschaft und Evidenz. Beobachtungen zum Wissenschaftstheoretischen ansatz des Jakob von Metz," in *Sapientiae procerum amore: Mélanges Médiévistes offerts à Dom Jean-Pierre Müller O.S.B.*, *Studia Anselmiana*, 63 (Roma: Editrice Anselmiana, 1974): 369–414 and Koch, "Jakob von Metz," 135–136.

90. Indeed, as was the case with Durandus, Natalis' explication of his understanding of theology was dominated by Aristotelian concepts and concerns. This departure from the precedent set by Aquinas has troubled some scholars, prompting Paul de Vooght to write, "Hervé de Nédellec ne touche pas aux questions essentielles, et à quel point il a déjà perdu le sens biblique de son Maître, Thomas d'Aquin, le prouve à suffisance ce fait étonnant que, dans aucun des *ses* contra, on ne trouve de texte ni scripturaire ni patristique." in *Les sources de la doctrine chrétienne*, 61.

91. Durandus, *In Sent.* Prol. Q. 1 (Guerraes): "Theologia videtur posse accipi tripliciter: Uno modo pro habitu, quo solum vel principaliter assentimus his, quae in sacra scriptura traduntur, et prout in ea traduntur."

92. *Ibid.*: "Secundo accipitur Theologia, pro habitu, quo fides, et ea quae in sacra scriptura traduntur, defenduntur, et declarantur, ex quibusdam principiis nobis notioribus."

93. *Ibid.*: "Habitus quo sacra scriptura, et contenta in ea, defenduntur et declarantur, se habet ad sacram scripturam, sicut se haec habitus opinativus circa unumquodque cognoscibilem, ad scientiam de illis scibilibus. ... Sed propter habitum opinativum, annexum Naturali scientiae, vel Geometriae, non dicitur, quod sunt duae Geometriae: Ergo nec propter supra dictum habitum annexum sacrae scripturae, debet dici, quod sint duae Theologiae." For Henry, see Stephen F. Brown, "Henry of Ghent's 'De reductione artium ad theologiam,'" 194–206.

94. Gyabba, *Aspects of medieval theology*, 197.

95. *Ibid.*, q. 7, 12: "Principia scientiae non sufficit esse credita ex sola auctoritate alterius, quia, cum principia debeant esse evidentiora conclusionem, conclusio non esset nisi credita et non scita. Sunt ergo evidentialia in scientia subalterna, non aliquo illorum modorum de quibus agitur, sed via sensus, memoriae et experientiae, modo quo determinat Philosophus primo Metaphysicae. Et sic omnis scientia subalterna facit evidentiam de suis principiis quantum ad quia est," Prologue, *Sentences*, q. 1, 5 and "Quamvis theologia nostra dependeat a scientia Dei et Beatorum propter conditionem status nostri quamdiu sumus viatores, tamen non subalternatur ei proprie secundum aliquem praedictorum modorum. Cuius ratio est quia ubicumque est vera et perfecta subalternatio, scientia subalternans dicitur propter quid de principiis scientiae subalternae de quibus ipsa solum dicit quia."

96. Durandus' positing of this question was to have a tremendous amount of influence on future generations of scholastics. For discussion, see Romanus Cessario, "Saint Thomas, Durand de Saint-Pourçain et Capreolus: le débat sur la foi," and Kevin White, "Saint Thomas et Durand de Saint-Pourçain: la question de la certitude de la foi," in *Jean Capreolus en son temps (1380–1444)*, ed. Guy Bedouelle, Romanus Cessario & Kevin White, *Mémoire Dominicaine*, numéro spécial 1 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1997): 159–164 and 165–176.

97. Durandus, "prologue," Sent.: "Tertio accipitur Theologia communis (nescio si verius pro habitu eorum) quae deducuntur ex articulis fidei, et ex dictis sacrae scriptura, sicut conclusione ex principiis: his modus nunc vertitur communiter in ore loquentium. ..."

98. *Ibid.*: "... et huic concordat communis doctrina quae dicit quod unus homo potest simul cognoscere eandem conclusionem per medium probabile et demonstrativum. Thomas prima secundae quaestionis."

99. IV d. 17 q. 8 n. 9 (Guerraera): "Haec sunt simpliciter verba glosatoris in quibus sunt plures errores periculosos in fide, et mirum est quod in tam solemnibus libro ecclesiae sustinuit, et adhuc sustinet tam perniciosam glosam, ut magis postea patebit."

100. III, d. 24, q. 1 (Guerraera): "Credimus Deum esse trinum et unum ... quia scriptura hoc dicit, quam credimus esse a Deo inspiratam et revelatam, ergo credere scripturam esse a Deo inspiratam, est ratio credendi illa quae in scriptura traduntur et sic est per prius creditum: rursus credimus scripturam esse a Deo inspiratam, quia ecclesia quae regitur a Spiritu sancto, hoc approbat quum enim multi scriperint gesta Salvatori ... illa sola scriptura recipitur ut canonica, et ei soli fides adhibetur, quam ecclesia approbavit. ..."

101. III, d. 25, q. 2 ad 1 (Guerraera): "Supra sacram scripturam nihil addendum est quod sit dissonum sacrae scripturae ipsam in aliquo diminuens, aut corrumpens, sed bene potest addi illud quod per sacram scripturam habet amplius declarari. ... Ea enim, quae sparsum continentur in sacra scriptura, et sunt ad credendum magis necessaria, utile est de sacra scriptura excerpere, et in unum colligere ad faciliorem instructionem simplicium et contra versutiam haereticorum, et sic factum est per symbolum."

102. Synan, "Sensibility and Science," 535.

103. Hervaeus Natalis, *Defensa*, 2, 1, a. 9, 47: "Alio modo accipi fides magis stricte pro habitu, quo assentimus alicui revelato absolute, non ut deducto ex alio."

104. *Ibid.*, 2, 1, a. 9, 47: "Et videtur mihi quod theologia nihil aliud est quam quidam habitus creditivus discursivus faciens fidem de his, quae virtualiter et implicite in fidei articulis continentur propter credulitatem primorum creditorum, quae sunt fidei articuli, in quo distinguitur a fide et scientia. Et cum eis convenit, quia in hoc, quod est habitus creditivus convenit cum fide et distinguitur a scientia, quae est habitus evidens. In hoc autem, quod est habitus discursivus, differt a fide, quae non est habitus discursivus, et convenit cum scientia, quae est habitus discursivus."

105. *Ibid.*, 2, 1, a. 9, 47-48: "... licet theologia large accepta pro consideratione tradita de divinis a doctoribus sive utendo auctoritatibus sanctorum, sive utendo auctoritatibus philosophorum et etiam manu ductione aliquarum rationum persuasivarum, posset dici theologia, tamen videtur mihi, quod ad theologiam proprie dictam non pertinent articula sumpta ex qualibet auctoritate humana nec argumenta sumpta ex quacumque humana persuasione, sed solum videtur mihi, quod ad theologiam proprie dictam pertinent rationes sumptae ex auctoritate divina nobis in sacra scriptura a Deo revelata vel tradita, ..."

106. *Ibid.*: "Iste habitus non debet dici theologia proprie dicta, sed est quidam habitus annexus theologiae proprie dictae."

107. Hervaeus Natalis, "Prologue" to *Sentences*, q. 1, 1: "Theologia non est scientia simpliciter dicta, nec scientia subalterna, sed large loquendo dicitur scientia, et magis disitur scientia subalterna quam alia."

108. Hervaeus, "De articulis pertinentibus ad lib. I Sententiarum Durandus de s. Porciano," Vat lat. 817, f. 15: "Est autem sciendum quod, quando dico theologiam subalternari scientiae beatorum, non intelligo quod subalternetur ei sicut scientia subalternatur scientiae, quia, sicut inferius patebit, theologia non est scientia subalternata proprie dicta, sed subalternatur ei sicut habitus creditivus habitui evidenti,"

109. Natalis, *Defensa*, 37: "Unde videtur mihi quod, quando frater Thomas in aliquo loco dicit theologiam esse scientiam subalternam, quod non intendit quod theologia sit sicut scientia subalterna quantum ad hoc quod scientia subalterna inventa ab homine habet processum scientificum, sed quantum ad hoc similitudinem cum ea."

110. Natalis, "Prologue," *Sentences*, q. 7, 19. "Accipiendo ergo rationem ex parte cognoscentis, ratio et modus cognoscendi secundum quem quid consideratur in Theologia est revelabilitas sive credibilitas revelabilium: nam proprius modus theologiae est credere ea quae a Deo revelantur."

111. In his bibliography, Pablo Piccardi cites Hervaeus Natalis, *Quaestio de unitate theologiae*, Series of hitherto unedited texts of medieval thinkers, 5 (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1970). However, I have been unable to locate this publication: it is not in OCLC or RLIN, nor is it contained in any of the online catalogs of the Toronto University Libraries, which generally possesses in-house publications.

112. *Ibid.*: "... quod probant sic: quia illa scientia est affectiva cuius finis principalis est amor vel affectio sed Theologia est huiusmodi ergo ipsa est affectiva. ... Si autem est affectiva non est speculativa nec practica: quia speculativum vel practicum pertinent ad intellectum, affectivum autem pertinet ad voluntatem."

113. *Ibid.*: "... ubi habitus ordinatur ad aliquem finem mediante merito, consecutio finis est secundum modum meriti et non secundum modum habitus. Beatior enim est vetula vel idiota magni meriti quam Doctor in Theologia parvi meriti: imo vetula bona vel idiota consequitur finem illum. ... Absque habitu Theologiae: doctor autem malus habens habitum absque merito non consequitur. ..."

114. Prol. Q. 4, 12: "Tertium, quod Theologia sit speculativa, & secundarium practica, ..." See also Hervaeus Natalis, "Die gegen Durandus gerichtete streitschrift des Hervaeus Natalis <<De articulis pertinentibus ad primum librum sententiarum Durandi>> (Art. 1-5)," ed. Takeshiro Takada in *Sapientiaeprocerum amore*: 439-455.

115. Prologue (Moreau), q. 7, 18: "Respondeo, hic sunt duo declaranda: Primum, quo Deus sit subiectum huius scientiae. ..."

116. *De articulis*, 439: "Medium etiam, per quod probatur, est falsum, sc. quod subiectum theologiae deductivae sit solum opus humanum meritorium, nisi quantum ad partem talis theologiae."

117. *Ibid.*, 440. "Item autem ... falsum est, quia materia tota primi libri Sententiarum et secundi et pro magna part tertii et quarti a resurrectione, et deinceps pertinet ad theologiam speculativam. Sed de tali materia multae deductiones fiunt ibi, sicut apparet manifest intuenti, non solum concludentes ex ratione humana, sed ex auctoritate divina."

118. Durandus was referring the article, "Quod Deus numquam plus creavit intelligentiam quam modo creat," which was included in the Condemnations of 1277 at Paris. Hisette, *Enquête sur les 219 art.*, no. 35.

119. Quol. II, 1. 16, Zimarra, 65va-66ra. See also Johannes von Beumer, "Schiftlose theologie? Zu den Prinzipien im Sentenzenkommentar des Hervaeus Natalis O.P.," *Scholastik* 40 (1965): 398-404, esp. 404.

120. *Ibid.*: "... sicut studere ad confirmandum ea que sunt fidei est meritorium ita etiam studere ad reprobandum et extirpandum ea que sunt contra fidem est meritorium"

121. *Ibid.*, "... sed tractare isto mon quaestiones artis pericio se et studere est extirpare ea que sunt contraria salti..."

122. *Ibid.*: "... sic studere in geometricis quantum est ex parte manr non importat meritum vel demeritum: licet sum intentionem studentis posset esse meritum vel demeritum."

123. *Ibid.*: "Si autem propter iactantiam vel aliam vanitatem quis studeret in eis peccaret: sed non semper mortaliter. ..."

124. *Ibid.*, 66: "... nisi propter errorem annexum ... accidit circa studium talium quaestionum vel in casu in quo ex precepto tenentur vacare aliis quaestionibus. ..."

125. Hervaeus Natalis, *Reprobationes excusationes Durandi* in Joseph Koch, "Durandus de S. Porciano," BGPMA 26 (1927): 225-226.

126. *Ibid.*, 225: "Quantum ad primum sciendum, quod articuli, qui ponuntur disputandia a theologis, possunt se habere in triplici differencia. ..."

127. *Ibid.*: "Uno modo, quod simpliciter sint determinati auctoritate Sacre Scripture vel auctoritate Ecclesie. ..."

128. *Ibid.*: "... v. gr. De articulo Trinitatis, de processione Spiritus Sancti a Patre et Filio."

129. *Ibid.*: "Alio modo, quod non explicite habeatur determinacio eorum ex auctoritate Sacre Scripture vel Ecclesie, magis communis tamen doctrina doctorum et sanctorum declinat in unam partem quam in aliam ..."

130. *Ibid.*: "v. gr. De resurrectione Christi media nocte vel diluculo."

131. *Ibid.*: "Tercio modo potest esse articulus, qui nec fide nec determinacione Ecclesie nec auctoritate Sacre Scripture est determinatus ad aliquam partem, nec auctoritas sanctorum vel determinacio declinat in unam partem plus quam in aliam, sed est mere indifferens. ..."

132. *Ibid.*: "... sicut si quereretur, utrum in celo et in inferioribus sit materia eiusdem rationis."

133. *Ibid.*: "Si autem aliquis in talibus articulis transiret recitando tantum, neutrum reprobans vel approbans, etsi non haberetur talis expresse [pro] heretico, quia nullam partem asserit probabilem vel improbabilem, tamen videtur haberi satis pro suspecto, quia quantum est ex parte talis processus, talis videtur dimittere in dubio talem articulum, cum tamen eum debeat habere pro certo; nec licet in tali materia dicere absolute, [quod] non videt rationem, quare hoc teneatur, quia in tali materia auctoritas Sacre Scripture vel Ecclesie est sufficiens racio, nec aliam necesse est querere; potest tamen dicere, quod non videt rationem naturalem hoc concludentem."

134. *Ibid.*, 226: "Quantum autem ad articulos tercii modi, indifferenter potest quancumque partem tenere vel absolute vel magis, quia, quancumque partem teneat, nec auctoritati Sacre Scripture nec Ecclesie nec cuicumque doctrine perfect obviat."

135. See above, 166, no. 101.

136. Quodlibet 3, q. 1, 70: "Dico quod si a nullo intellectu intelligeretur, essent veri lapides veritate materiali et fundamentali. Sed eis non competeret veritas formalis excluso omni intellectu."

138. The practice of fourteenth-century scribes of placing Natalis' and Durandus' *quaestiones* side by side within their compilations resulted, over time, in the identification of the two conflicting theologies in the minds of many of the *communes fratrum*. See Michael Tavuzzi, "Hervaeus Natalis and the Philosophical Logic of the Thomism of the Renaissance," *Doctor Communis* 45 (1992): 151–152.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

1. The earliest statement for a connection between the two is found in Koch, *Durandus de S. Porciano*: 389–394. Yet, because so few historians have examined the topic, Koch's hypothesis cannot, as yet, be regarded as having been proved. One exception to this generalization is M. Michelè Mulchahey, "First the bow," 153, who notes that the Dominican hierarchy recognized that Durandus posed "a far greater threat to Dominican unity ... than the condemnations ever had," and that the "widespread contumacy of Durand's followers ... finally made the order realize it would not... nurture consensus within the Dominican ranks. ..." unless it took some action.

2. Stephan Kuttner, "On 'auctoritas' in the writing of medieval canonists: the vocabulary of Gratian," in *La Notion d'Autorité au Moyen Age: Islam, Byzances, Occident, Colloques Internationaux de la Naples, 23–26 October, 1978*, ed. George Makdisi, Dominique Sourdel and Janine Sourdel-Thomine (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1982): 69–81; esp. p. 73. See also Vincenzo Piano Mortari, "L'argumentum ab auctoritate nel pensiero dei giuristi medievali," *Rivista italiana per le scienze giuridiche* 7 (1954): 458–468. Although there were notable differences between canon lawyers and theologians in the precise manner in which they applied their *auctoritates* to their disciplines, this fundamental definition is equally true for both groups.

3. The close and mutually inextricable relationship between the authority accorded a text and that awarded to its author has been noted elsewhere. Most recently, A. J. Minnis, "The author's two bodies? Authority and fallibility in late-medieval textual theory," in *Of the making of books: medieval manuscripts, their scribes and readers: essays presented to M. B. Parkes*, ed. P. R. Robinson and Rivkah Zim (Aldershot, England: Scolar Press, 1998): 259–260. At times, the practical manifestations of this identification could be negative. The Second Council of Constantinople, for example, set a precedent by excommunicating authors who were deceased, judging them "only by their texts, not their living words." A parallel connection has been established between the personality and virtue of medieval churchmen and the authority of ecclesiastical offices. The most explored example of this has been that of the papacy wherein a decline in the personal charismatic authority of individual popes coincided with the stabilization of the papacy as an institution. See James J. O'Donnell, "Authority of Augustine," *Augustinian Studies* 22 (1991): 7–35 for discussion.

4. In addition to the works cited above, the following section is based on Marcia Colish, "*Quae hodie locum non habent*: scholastic theologians reflect upon their authorities," in *Proceedings of the PMR Conference*, 15, ed. P. Pulsiano, (Villanova, PA: 1990): 1–17; Leonard Krieger, "The idea of authority in the West," *American Historical Review* (Feb.-June, 1977), 260; and Pierre Riché, "'Auctoritas', 'ratio', et 'divina pagina' dans la culture théologique à l'époque carolingienne," in *Nascita dell'Europa et Europa Carolingia: Un'equazione da verificare, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto medioevo*, 27 (Spoleto: Presso la sede del Centro, 1981) 2, 719–758.

5. The etymological history of *auctoritas* is discussed in Marie-Dominique Chenu's "Autor, Actor, Autor," *Bulletin du Cange* 3 (1927): 81–85; *La théologie au douzième siècle*, Études de philosophie médiévale, 45 (Paris: J. Vrin, 1957): 353–358; and *Towards understanding St. Thomas*, trans. A.M. Landry and D. Hughes, The library of living Catholic thought, (Chicago: Regnery, 1964): [originally published as *Introduction à l'étude de saint Thomas d'Aquin*]; as well as P. Hubert's, "Auctoritas," *Bulletin du Cange* 34 (1964): 101–124. Also consulted were Charles Du Fresnoy *Du Cange, Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis; Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, ed. Germanicarum Berolinensis, vol. 2 (Lipsiae: In aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1900–); and Roberto Busa, *Index Thomisticus: Sancti Thomae Aquinatis operum omnium indices et concordantiae in quibus verborum omnium et singulorum formae et lemmata cum suis frequentis et contextibus variis modis referuntur*, 1 (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1974).

6. Jacqueline Hamesse, "Le vocabulaire des florilèges médiévaux," in *Méthodes et instruments du travail intellectuel au moyen âge: Etudes sur le vocabulaire*, ed. Olga Weijers, CIVICIMA, 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1990), 211.

7. Chenu, *Toward understanding*, 131.

8. Roy J. Deferrari, *A Latin-English dictionary of St. Thomas Aquinas based on the Summa theologiae and selected passages of his other works*, (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1960), 99.

9. Alastair J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory*, 10.

10. Naturally, this does not mean that every text composed by an *auctor* was authoritative. For example, *axiomata* were non-authoritative texts written by authors (and other scholastic writers). See Jacqueline Hamesse, "Le vocabulaire," 214.

11. Olga Weijers, *Terminologie des universités au XIII^e siècle*, Lessico intellettuale Europeo, 39 (Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1987), 341.

12. M.B. Parkes, "The influence of the concepts of "*ordinatio*" and "*compilatio*" on the development of the book," in *Medieval learning & literature. Essays presented to R. W Hunt*, ed. J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibben, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976): 115–141 and A. J. Minnis, "Late medieval discussions of "*compilatio*" and the rôle of the compiler," in *Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 101 (1979): 385–421.

13. Edward Synan, "Brother Thomas, the Master & Masters," in *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*, 2 vols (Toronto: PIMS, 1974), 1:221. Hereafter cited as *Comm. St.*

14. *Opus tertium*, cap. 9, 31 in Marie-Dominique Chenu, "Auctor, actor, autor," 85: "... tamen non praesumpserunt de auctoritate, sed iste [Albert the Great] per modum authenticum scripsit libros suos, aut Avicennam, aut Averroem, et alios auctores," in; and, in regard to Albert the Great and Alexander of Hales, *Opus minus* in op. cit., 327: "Vulgus credit quod omnia sciverunt ... nam illi allegantur in disputationibus et lectionibus sicut auctores. Et maxime ille [Albert] qui vivit, habet nomen doctoris Parisiis, et allegatur in studio sicut auctor, quod non potest fieri sine confusione et destructione sapientiae."

15. *In primum librum sententiarum*, proem., q. 4 in S. Bonventura, *Opera omnia*, 11 v. in 10 fasc., (Ad Claras Aquas (Quarrachi): Ex typis Collegii Bonaventure, 1882), 1: 14.

16. Brian Tierney, "Only the truth has authority': the problem of 'reception' in the Decretalists and in John de Torrecremata," in *Law, Church, and society: essays in honor of Stephan Kuttner*, ed. Kenneth Pennington and Robert Somerville (Pittsburgh: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977): 69–96.

17. Leo J. Elders, "Thomas Aquinas and the Fathers of the Church," in *The reception of the church fathers in the West: from the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. Irena Backus with the assistance of Antoinina Bevan, 2 vols. (Leiden: New York: Brill, 1997), I, 342. It should be noted, however, that such instances of attacking an authoritative text's authenticity were rare.

18. See, for example, *De Eruditione* cited in Simon Tugwell, O.P., "Humbert of Romans, "Compiler"," in *Lector et compiler: Vincent de Beauvais, frère prêcheur un intellectuel et son milieu au XIII^e siècle*, sous la direction de Serge Lusignan and Monique Paulmer-Foucart avec la collaboration de Marie-Christine Duchenne, *Rencontres à Royamont*, (Grâne, France: Editiones Créaphis, c. 1997), 54: "In cathedra sancti Petri. Nota quod iste sermo in quibuscum libris antiquis in titulatur Augustino, in quibusdam Maximo episcop, in quibusdam Leoni pape. ..."

19. Louis Jacques Bataillon, "L'activité intellectuelle des Dominicains de la première génération," in *Lector et compiler*: 15–16.

20. Jacques Verger, "Patterns," in *Universities in the Middle Ages*, 41.

21. Colish, "*Quae hodie*," 2–4.

22. Jaroslav Palikan, *The growth of medieval theology (600–1300)*, The Christian tradition: A history of the development of doctrine, 3 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 285. See, for example, Aquinas, *STII.7*.

23. M-D. Chenu, "«Maitre» Thomas est-il une «Autorité»? : Note sur deux lieux théologiques au XIV^e siècle," *Revue Thomiste* 30 (1925), 192.

24. The formula of God as the *auctor* of Scripture, and even of theology, was coined during the struggle against Manichaeism. See Augustin Bea, "Deus auctor Sacra Scripturae. Herkunft und Bedeutung der Formel," *Angelicum* 20 (1943), 27–28.

25. A. J. Minnis and A. Brian Scott, *Medieval literary theory and criticism c. 1100–1375* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1988): 198–199. Hereafter cited as *Theory and criticism*.

26. Minnis, *Medieval Theory*, 115.

27. O'Donnell, "The Authority of Augustine," 7–35.

28. II Sent., q. 58, ad. 14; II, 482 cited in Robert Pasnau, *Theories of cognition in the later Middle Ages*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 130: "Aristoteles nulla sufficienti ratione, immo fere nulla ratione probat suum dictum, sed absque ratione creditur sibi tanquam deo huius saeculi. ..."

29. G. R. Evans, "Exegesis and Authority," 93.

30. Chenu, *Towards understanding*, 137.

31. *Ibid.*, 135. It is interesting to note that bachelors were not accorded any magisterial authority whatsoever.

32. Stephen Brown, "Key terms in medieval theological vocabulary," in *Methodes et instruments*, 87

and Arthur Michel Landgraf, *Introduction à l'histoire de la littérature théologique de la scolastique naissante*, éd. française Albert-M. Landry, trans. of *Einführung in die Geschichte der theologischen Literatur der Früh scholastik* by Louis-B. Gerger, Université de Montréal. Institut d'études médiévales. Publications, 22/22 (Montreal: Paris: Institut d'études médiévales, 1973): 24–25

33. Colish, "Quae hodie," 4.

34. A. Damasus Trapp, "Augustinian theology in the 14th century: notes on editions, marginalia, opinions and book-lore," *Augustiniana*, 6 (1956): 146–274.

35. II^a II^{ae}, q. 5, a. 1, ad 1, cited in M-D. Chenu, "<<Maitre>> Thomas," 188, f. 1: "Quamvis dicta Hugonis a S. Victore magistralia sint, et robor auctoritas non habeant. ..." For further information on Aquinas' treatment of authorities, see Leo J. Elders, "Thomas Aquinas and the Fathers of the Church," in *The reception of the Church Fathers*, 337–366; Walter Principe, "Thomas Aquinas' principles for interpretation of patristic texts," *Studies in medieval culture*, 8 & 9, ed. John R. Sommerfeldt and E. Rozanne Elder (Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, The Medieval Institute, 1976): 111–121; M. Riquet, "St. Thomas et les auctoritates en philosophie," *Archives de philosophie* 3 (1925): 117–155; Edward Synan, "Brother Thomas, the Master and the Masters," *Comm St.*, 2: 210–244. For an intriguing look at how Aquinas conceptualized his own authority, see Christoph Schönborn, "Die Autorität des Lehrers nach Thomas von Aquin," in *Christian authority: essays in honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. G. R. Evans (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988): 101–126.

36. Marie-Dominique Chenu, "Antiqui, moderni. Notes de lexicographic médiévale," *RSPT* 17 (1928): 82–94.

37. Jacques-Guy Bougerol, "The Church Fathers and *auctoritates* in scholastic theology to Bonaventure," in *Reception of the Church Fathers*, 304.

38. Irene Backus, "Introduction," in *ibid*, xvi.

39. A. J. Minnis and A. B. Wallace, *Theory and criticism*: 374–375.

40. Antoine Dondaine, "Venerabilis Doctor," in *Mélanges offerts à Étienne Gilson de l'Académie Française* (Toronto: PIMS; Paris: Vrin, 1959): 211–225; Pierre Mandonnet, "Les titres doctoraux de Saint Thomas Aquinas," *Revue Thomist* 17 (1909): 597–608.

41. A. J. Minnis, "The author's two bodies?," 261.

42. Evans, "Theology: the vocabulary," 131.

43. Trapp, "Augustinian theology," 147.

44. Paul de Vooght, *Les sources de la doctrine Chrétienne*, 60. •

45. Chenu, *Toward understanding*, 136.

46. Cited in Koch, *Durandus*, 330, f. 60: "In ista questione erunt duo articuli. ... Primus est doctoris Sancti Thome, qui ponit, quod in omnibus citra Deum differt esse ab essentia; secundus ut omnes aliorum concorditer Parisiensium, qui dicunt oppositum; et isti distinguuntur tripliciter secundum quod ponunt diversas declarationes."

47. Alain de Lille, *De fide catholica*, 1, 30; PL 210, 333.

48. Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet, *The color of melancholy: the uses of books in the fourteenth century*, translated by Lydia G. Cochrane (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 20.

49. Hervaeus Natalis in *Litterae encyclicae magistrorum generalium ord. Praedicatorum 1233–1376*, ed. B. M. Reichert, MOPH, 5 (Rome: 1900), 222 and 223, respectively: "Christianae aim ecclesie exordio, cum fides rerum invisibilium per visibilia miracula predicaretur hominibus, ipso apostolo Paulo epychurei et stoici in actibus apostolorum leguntur obicem posuisse, quanquam et ipse apostolus fidem, quam seminabat in gentibus ..." and "... hortari et exorare per viscera misericordie die nostri, quatenus sicut imitatore veri predicatoris gencium ... instuendo, ut instructi de thesauro scripturarum nova et vetera proferatis. ..."

50. F. Bottin, "La polemica contro i *moderni loyici* (G. di Ockham e N. di Autrecourt) nella Decas loyca di Leonino da Padova," *Medioevo* 4 (1978), 140–142.

51. "Definitiones Capituli Generalis Argentinae celebrati anno 1282," ed. G. Fussenegger, *AFH* 26 (1933), 139.

52. Mulcahey, "First the bow," 158.

53. MS. 35, Archivo Capitular de la Santa Iglesia Catedral Basilica, Barcelona. Joseph Koch, "Zu codex 24 des Archivo del Cabildo catedral de Barcelona," *AFP* 13 (1943), 46.

54. *Consitutiones antiquae*, Thomas, 363: "... nullus ... fratrum nostrorum legat in psalmis vel prophetis alium sensum litteralem, nisi sancti approbant et confirmant."

55. The closest the Carmelites come to strict regulation is the ordination laid down by their General Chapter of 1336 in B. Xiberta, *De scriptoribus scholasticis saeculi XIV ex Ordine Carmelitarum*, *Bibliothèque de la Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, 6 (Louvain: Dominikanenkloster 1931), 62: "Item cum religiosos non liceat ad vanitatem studere sed solum ut sibi et proximis fide et moribus in ecclesia Dei

proposit, statiminus quod nullus cuiuscumque gradus existat lecturae et studio deputatus scientia sana relictis imaginationes phantasticas seu opiniones quas prima facie male sonare viderint discere seu docere praesumat.”

56. M. Brlek, *De evolutione iuridicia studiorum in Ordine Minorem (ab initio Ordinis usque ad an 1517)*, Facultas de Urbe Iuris Canonici, (Dubrovnik, Croatia: Pontificium Athenaeum Antonianum, 1942), 349: “Nullus ... frater dicti Ordinis ad legendum in praememoratis studiis Sententias assumatur, nisi prius legerit IV libros Sententiarum cum scriptis approbatorum docotrum in aliis studiis ...”

57. Célestin Douais, *Les Frères Prêcheurs en Gascogne au XIII^{me} et au XIV^{me} siècle*, 157.

58. E. Ypma, *La formation des preofesseurs chez Ermites de Saint-Augustin de 1256 à 1354* (Paris: Centre d'Études Augustins, 1956): 64–65: “Quia venerabilis magistri nostri fratris Aegidii doctrina mundum universum illustrat, definimus et mandamus inviolabiliter observari, ut opiniones positiones, sententias scriptas et scribendis praedicti magistri nostri, omnes ordinis nostri lectores et studentes recipiant, eisdem praebentis assensum et eius doctrinae omni qua poterunt sollicitudine, ut et ipsi illuminati alios illuminare possint, sint seduli defensores. ...”

59. Damasus Trapp, “Augustinian theology,” 25.

60. Natalis, IV *Sent.* D. 13, q. 2, 358 (Moreau): “Fides est per quam homo credit et eis quae credit Ecclesia.”

61. • *Ibid.*: “... idest articulos fidei et dicta sacrae scripturae et quae determinantur ab Ecclesia, et utiliter tenetur. Modo quidam redunt ab utroque istorum, quia nec credunt Christum cui creditur, nec rem creditam, scilicet articulos fidei et dicta sacrae scripturae: quidam vero recedunt ab altero tantum, quia ... non tenent rem creditam, scilicet articulos fidei: sed perverterunt sensum sacra scripturae.”

62. *Ibid.*: “Dicendum, quod multa facta sunt a Christo, quae non sunt scripta in Evangelio ... non est scripta a Christo ne scriptura ad infideles veniret et deriderent nos ungentes nos oleo.”

63. III *Sent.*, d. 25, q. 2, ad 1, 259 (Moreau): “Supra sacram scripturam nihil addendum est quod sit dissonum sacrae scripturae ipsam in aliquo diminuens, aut corruptens, sed bene potest addi illud quod per sacram scripturam habet amplius declarari ... quae sparsim continentur in sacra scriptura, et sunt ad credendum magis necessaria, utile est de sacra scriptura excerpere, et in unum colligere ad faciliorem instructionem simplicium et contra versutia haereticorum, et sic factum est per symbolum.”

64. Durandus, *Quol. Par. I*, 27: “Videamus ergo de illis duabus viis quae sit convenientior. Nec intendo asserere quae sit verior, sed ponam vel recitabo illas duas vias et difficultates emergentes contra eas et evasiones difficultatum.”

65. Durandus, *Quol. Aven. I*, 59: “Joachim ... quia nec aliam intelligebat, nec intelligere poterat secundum principia quas tenebat.” ST la, q. 39, a. 5 ad 1.

66. Durandus, *Quol. Par. I*, 26–27: “Et ideo volens salvare conclusiones fidei per aliquam viam quae non est fidei data quod circa illam viam erret, nullo tamen modo debet dici errare contra fidem, quia statim ut sibi apparet quod illa via esset repugnativa fidei, statim viam illam dimitteret et fidei semper firmiter adhaereret.”

67. Durand of St. Pourçain, “Q. XVIIa: Utrum monachus pus teneatur oboedire abbati quam episcopo vel papae,” in *Quodlibeta Avenionensia tria*: 152–159.

68. *Ibid.*, 152: “Quia oboedientia religiosorum, quantum ad predicta, est ex voto eorum ... in talibus oboedire abbati, et non episcopo vel papae.”

69. *Ibid.*: “Votum, autem, religionis non est ad oboediendum in omnibus. Nullius, enim, religionis professio talem habet formam. Sed est ad oboediendum secundum regulam et legitima statua religionis.”

70. *Ibid.*: “... si abbas praecipiat monacho servare statuta legitmata sui ordinis, puta remanere in claustro, ire ad chorum, tenere silentium, et huiusmodi

71. *Ibid.*, 155: “Nec solum est verum de statutis caeremonialibus religionis, immo etiam de principalibus votis. Tanta, enim, posset esse necessitas et utilitas tanta procurari universali Ecclesiae per matrimonium, quod religiosus vel religiosa, ad praeceptum papae, tenenter in matrimonium consentire, non obstante voto proprio et abbas praecepto.”

72. *Ibid.*, 154. “... qua tenetur papae, cuius est procurare utilitatem universalis Ecclesiae ...”

73. *Ibid.*, 158: “... sicut expresse dicit auctoritas beati Bernardi... <<Nihil me praelatus prohibeat horum, quae promisi>>. Sic, igitur, patet quod monachus non tenetur cuicumque oboedire, papae vel abbati, praecipienti sibi, sine ulla causa necessitatis vel utilitatis, transgredi vota sua et legitima statuta, ad quae servanda se obligavit; quin potius, quia sunt opera supererogationis, quae Christus suasit ...”

74. *Ibid.*: “... papa vero praecipiat eidem monacho quod exeat claustrum, quia pro utilitate Ecclesiae vult eum mittere in aliquam legationem, oboediendum est papae, non obstante praecepto abbatis ...”

75. Charles Abraham Zuckerman, *Dominican theories of the papal primacy, 1250–1320*, (Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1971). See also Thomas Izbicki, “Infallibility and the erring pope: Guido Terreni and Johannes de Turrecrema,” in *Law, church and society*, ed. K. Pennington and R. Somerville

(Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977): 97–111 and Thomas Turley, “Infallibilists in the curia of Pope John XXII,” *Journal of medieval history*, 1 (1975): 71–101.

76. A surprisingly staunch champion of papal primacy, Durandus held that Christ had conferred the episcopate on Peter and not on the other apostles who then received it from Peter. See *IV Sent.* D. 24, q. 5.

77. John Thomas Marrone, *The ecclesiology of the secular masters, 1250–1320*, (Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1972).

78. *Acta prov. Rom.*, 197: “... sanam et sacram doctrinam venerabilis doctoris fr. Thome de Aquino ... multitudine fratrum et aliorum litteratorum vivorum secularium, clericorum et aliorum religiosorum ... contra reventiam sui lectoris superbe et arroganter multa dixit, quod etiam inauditum est, determinando in cathedra contra determinationem ipsius sui lectoris.”

79. Durand of St. Pourçain, *II Sent.*, d. 30, q. 3, Vat Lat. 1075, f. 9ra.: “Ex quo apparet quod ipse non reputat hanc opinionem heresim esse Pelagii vel ei propinquam, sicut quidam ydiote dixerunt.” A later commentator noted in the margins that the remark was “inconsiderate.”

80. *Quo. Aven.*, I, q. 10, 122

81. For instance, Durandus’ judgement of the teachings of the fraticelli at Marseille in 1318, Haureau, “Durand de Saint-Pourçain,” 8: “Ego fr. Druandus, episcopus Aniciensis et doctor sacre theologie, judico omnes suprascriptos articulos et quemlibet eorum esse hereticos. In ejus rei testimonium. ...”

82. Because Hervaeus did not explicate his views on the use of authorities within theology with either as much exactitude or vehemence as did his former protégé, his conception of their role has to be induced from his texts. Despite this obstacle, the extant sources provide much indirect evidence as to Natalis’ views.

83. *III Sent.*, d. 3, q. 1, 289: “Ista opinio non videtur mihi posse stare cum auctoritate scripturae sacrae, et dictis communibus sanctorum et doctorum” and, “... repugnat auctoritati sacrae scripturae et sanctorum,” and *III Sent.*, d. 3, q. 1, 291.

84. Johannes Beumer, “Schriftlose theologie? Zu den Prinzipien im Sentenzenkommentar des Hervaeus Natalis, O.P.,” *Scholastik* 40 (1965), 403.

85. De Vooght, *Les sources*, 72.

86. Durandus of St. Pourçain, “Prologue,” *In Petri Lombardi sententias theologicas commentariorum libri III* (Venetiis: ex typographica Guerraea, 1571): “Omnis homo dimittens rationem propter auctoritatem humanam incidit in insipientiam bestialem.” and “Praefatio,” in *ibid.*, 12: “Et tamen Augustinus inter Doctores celeberrimus, dicit ...: Noli meis literis, quasi scripturis canonicis inservire ... Quod compellere seu inducere aliquem, ne doceat vel scribat dissona ab iis, quae determinatus Doctor scripsit, est talem Doctorem praeferre sacris Doctoribus, praecludere viam inquisitioni veritatis.”

87. *Ibid.*: “Quis enim nisi temerarius existens, audeat dicere, quod magis sit acquiescendum auctoritati cuiuscunque Doctoris, quam auctoritati sanctorum Doctorum sacrae scripturae, Augustini, Gregorii, Ambrosii et Hieronymi, quos celebritate condigna sancta Romana Ecclesia sublimavit? ... Ex quibus patet, quod compellere, seu inducere aliquem, ne doceat, vel scribat dissona ab iis, quae determinatus Doctor scripsit, est talem Doctorem praeferre sacris Doctoribus, praecludere viam inquisitioni veritatis, et praestare impedimentum sciendi, et lumen rationis, non solum occultare sub modio, sed comprimere violenter” and “Modus autem loquendi ac scribendi in caeteris quae fidem non tangunt est ut magis innitatur rationi quam auctoritati cuiuscunque doctoris, quantuncunque celebris, vel solnnis; et parvipendatur omnis humana autoritas, quando per rationem elucescit contraria veritas.”

88. “Prologue,” q. 1 (Moreau): “Quia ad ea quae non transcenunt virtutem luminis naturalis potuerunt Philosophi per investigationem naturalem attingere; nec ad talia indigemus revelatione supernaturali: Sed ad ea quae sunt fidei, nec Philosophi potuerunt per investigationem naturalem attingere nec sine revelatione possunt attingi.”

89. *II Sent.*, d. 23, q. 1, 227: “Doctores provant quod ... auctoritate novae legis et auctoritate Genes. Et persuadent ratione.”

90. *I. Sent.*, d. 2, q. 2, 17: “... quodam Theologia utitur quibusdam probatis in Metaphysica, accipiendo ea a Metaphysica, sed accipit ea ut revelata a Deo. Et dato etiam quod acciperet aliqua a Metaphysica in obsequium sui, non tamen sequeretur quod subalternaretur ei, nisi essent talia quae dicerent propter quid respectu principiorum Theologie quae sunt articuli: quod esse non potest.”

91. *II Sent.* d. 3, q. 2: “Amicus Aristoteles, sed magis amica veritas.”

92. *IV Sent.* d. 44, q. 1: “Naturalis philosophia non est quod Aristoteles et alii philosophi seneserint, sed quod habeat veritas rerum. Unde, ubi deviat mens Aristoteles a veritate rerum, non est scientia scire quid Aristoteles seneserit, sed potius error ... de Aristotele non est tantum curandum sicut de veritate.”

93. For Durandus’ discussion of the dispute between Bernard of Clairvaux and Gilbert of Poitiers, see *Quol. Par.* I, 50.

94. Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, 355.

95. Mulcahey, "First the bow," 152.
96. Natalis, *Reprobationes excusationes Durandi* in Koch, "Durandus," 225–226.
97. *Ibid.*: "Quantum ad articulos secundi modi, licet non oporteat necessario declinare in hanc partem aut in illam, tamen magis declinare in illam, a quam. Videntur doctrina communis et sancti magis discordare, videtur michi non esse tutum et esse presumptuosum, maxime cum nullus debeat perficere suum ingeium tot et tantis."
98. Walter Senner, "Jean de Sterngassen et son commentaire des Sentences," RT 97 (1997), 86.
99. Durandus of St. Pourçain, *Quolibet Parisiense I*, "Utrum omnia, illa, quae differunt realiter in eodem supposito, faciant compositionem," in *Quol. Par. I*, 41: "Quod in patre differant realiter paternitas et spiratio, non solum ponunt aliqui antiqui et moderni doctores, sed etiam doctor communis beati Thomas videtur hoc posuisse, ..."
100. Durandi de S. Porciano, *Quol. Paris I Q 2 (3)*, in *ibid.*, 44–45.
101. Hervaeus Natalis, *De relatione contra Durandum*, ed. Takeshiro Takada, Series of hitherto unedited texts of medieval thinkers, 3 (Kyoto: s.p., 1966), 17: "Preterea ex ista auctoritate magis concluditur oppositum quam popositum, quia eo ipso, quod fundantur in respectu, non sunt ipse respectus, quia nihil fundatur in se ipso."
102. Natalis, *Reprobationes*, cited in Koch, *Durandus*, 169, n. 2: "Istam conclusionem ... non teneo ad praehens, sed teneo cum doctrina et doctore communi, qui hance questionem movet sub eisdem terminis prima parte Summae, quastione octogesima tertia, articulo secundo, quod liberum arbitrium non est habitus, nec actus elicitus, sed est potentia intellectus vel voluntatis vel utrumque simul."
103. Hervaeus Natalis, "Defensa doctrina Divi Thomae," in *Theologie und Wissenschaft nach der Lehre der Hochscholastik. An der Hand der bisher ungedruckten Defensa doctrina D. Thomae des Hervaeus Natalis mit Begabunggedruckter und ungedruckter Paralleltext*, ed. Eugene Krebs, BGPTMA, 11, 2–4 (1912): 1–114. Hereafter cited as *Defensa*. Another edition of the *Defensa* is idem., "Opinio de difficultatibus contra doctrinam fratris Thome," ed. Paolo Piccari in *Disputat theologica devozione e utopia (sec. XIV–SVI)*, Memorie Domenicane, ns. 26 (1995): 5–193. Hereafter cited as *Opinio*.
104. See, for instance, Durandus of St. Pourçain, *De Libero Arbitrio* in, "Le *Quaestiones de libero arbitrio*" di Durando da S. Porciano, ed. Prospero T. Stella, *Salesianum* 3 (1962): 450–524: "Ad rationes Magistrorum, et primo ad illas magistri Thomae, dicendum ad primam, quod liberum arbitrium est potentia rationalis."
105. Durandus, *Quol. Aven. Ill*, 215: "Tertio, quia frater Thomas dicit quod accidit speciei inhaerere, ad hoc quod eliciat actum intelligendi, cum non est inconveniens quod aliquis intellectus intelligat per formam, quae sibi non inhaeret nec est pars eius. ... Haec autem, opinio et in se est absurda, et palliatio eius frivola."
106. Durandus, *Quol. Par. I*, q. 2, 44–45: "Hoc ergo viso, quod questio quantum ad aliquid habet locum in Deo. Circa solutionem eius procedetur sic, quia primo ponetur una opinio quam non credo veram. Et secundo arguetur contra eam. Et tertio ponetur illud quod credo verius. Et respondebitur ad rationem in oppositum."
107. Natalis' polemics did not begin to hold sway within the magisterial community at large, until he was elected Master General in 1318. See Mulcahey, "First the bow," 159; and Koch, *Durandus*, 292–314.
108. Ferét, "Durand," 28–30; Glorieux, *La littérature quodlibétique*, 62; Koch, *Durandus*, 99–117.
109. See, for example, Natalis, *De relatione contra Durandum*, 17: "Ad auctoritatem autem illius auctoris dicendum, quod ille auctor non intelligit. ..."
110. Most particularly, Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Thomism and the Italian thought of the Renaissance," in *Medieval aspects of renaissance learning: three essays*, ed. Edward P. Mahoney (New York: Columbia University Press Morningside Edition: 1992): 29–95. Originally published by Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1974. Although the essays in the 1992 editions are verbatim reprints of the 1974 edition, the former also includes: addenda and corrigenda, pp. 159–164 and as well as an extremely useful annotated bibliography, entitled, "Studies on St. Thomas and the Italian Renaissance (1974–1992): an overview," 165–178. In addition, the Morningside edition (unlike the Columbia University Press edition, issued the same year) also contains a new preface.
111. Anthony Kenny, "Introduction," *Aquinas: a collection of critical essays*, ed. Anthony Kenny, Modern studies in philosophy, (Garden City: Anchor books, 1976), 23.
112. Gilson, *History of Christian philosophy*, 447–471; Kenny, "Introduction," in *Aquinas: a collection*, 23–24; and Leff, *Medieval thought*, 231–245.
113. *CUP*, 1: 504–505: "Si enim merito ecclesia ossa et reliquias sanctorum honorat ... tanti doctoris corpus in perpetuum honorem haberi, ut cujus famam apud nos scripta perpetuant, ejusdem perseverans memoria sepulture ipsorum in cordibus successorum nostrorum stabiliat sine fine ... humiliter supplicamus ut cum quedam scripta ad phylosophiam spectantia, Parisius inchoata ab eo, que in suo

recessu reliquerit imperfecta, et ipsum credamus, ubi translatus fuerat, complerive, nobis benivolentia vestra cito communicari procuret, et specularetur super librum Simplicii, super librum de celo et mundo; et expositionem Tymeï Platonis, ac librum de aquarum conductibus et ingeniis erigendis, de quibus nobis mittendis speciali promissione fecerat mentionem. Si qua similiter ad loycam pertinentia composuit, sicut quando recessit a nobis humiliter petivimus ab eodem ... "For background, see Alexander Birkenmajer, "Ad litteras Universitatis Parisiensis de obitu S. Thomae analiecta nova," in *Xenia Thomistica*; vol. 3: *Tratatus historico-criticus continens*, (Rome: Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1925): 57–72.

114. Martin Grabmann, "La scuola thomistica italiana nel XIII e principio de XIV secolo," *Rivista de filosofia neo-scolastica* 15 (1923): 99–155.

115. Peter of Bergamo, *In opera Sancti Thomae Aquinatis index; seu tabula aurea Eximii*, editio fototypica (Roma: Editiones Paulinae, 1880).

116. Louis J. Bataillon, "La diffusionne manuscrite dei commenti biblici di San Tommaso d'Aquino," *Angelicum* 71 (1994): 559.

117. Kristeller, "Thomism and Italian thought," 47.

118. Mary A. Rouse and Richard H. Rouse, *Authentic witnesses: approaches to medieval texts and manuscripts*, Publications in medieval studies, ed. John Van Engen, 22 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991): 286–288.

119. R. A. Gauthier, "Les 'articuli' in quibus frater Thomas melius in Summa quam Scriptis," *RTAM* 19 (1952): 271–326.

120. E. Delaruell, "La translatinudes reliques," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 56 (1955): 129–46.

121. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas*, 331 and 343. For the origins of Thomas' cult at Fossanova, see Dominic Prummer, O.P./ M.H. Laurent, O.P. *Fontes vita sancti Thomae Aquinatis: notis historicis et criticis illustrati omnino* (Toulouse: Privat, 1912–1937), vols. 4 & 5, 265–610. Prummer's edition contains complete transcriptions of all three *vitae*: namely, those of Guillelm de Tocco, Petrus Calo and Bernard Gui. A more recent, critical edition of Tocco's *vita* can be found in *Ystoria sancti Thome de Aquino de Guillaume de Tocco* (1323), ed. Claire le Brun-Gouanvic, *Studies & texts*, 127 (Toronto: PIMS, c.1996). An English translation of excerpts of the three *vitae* found in Prummer are available in *The life of Saint Thomas Aquinas. Biographical Documents*, ed. Kenelm Foster, (London: Longman, Green, 1959): 153–155. Secondary sources consulted on Thomas' reputation and cult during the early years following his death include: Torrell, *Saint Thomas*, originally published as *Initiation à Saint Thomas d'Aquin*; Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas*: 328–350; Edmund Colledge, "The legend of St. Thomas Aquinas," *Comm. St.*, I, 13–28; and E. Janssens, "Les premiers historiens de la vie Saint Thomas d'Aquin," *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie* 26 (1924): 201–214; 325–352; and 452–476.

122. Most recently, Leonardus V. Gerulaitis, "The canonization of Saint Thomas Aquinas," *Vivarium* 5 (1967): 25–46. See also Martin Grabmann, "Die Kanonisation des hl. Thomas von Aquin in ihre Bedeutung für die Ausbreitung und Verteidigung seiner Lehre im 14. Jahrhundert," *Divus Thomas*, 1 (1923): 233; Pierre Mandonnet, "La canonization de saint Thomas d'Aquin," *Mélanges Thomistes*, Bibliothèque thomiste (Le Saulchoire, Kain) 3 (1923): 2–48; Andre Vauchez, "Les canonisations de S. Thomas et de S. Bonaventur: pourquoi deux siècles de cart," in *1274 [Douze cent soixante-quatorze], année charnier, mutations et continuités: Lyon-Paris, 20–septembre-5 octobre 1974*, Colloques internationaux du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, no 558 (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1997): 753–767; and Angelus Walz, "Ordinationes capitulorum generalium de Sancto Thoma eiusque cultu et doctrina," *Analecta ordinis Praedicatorum*, 16 (1923–1924): 168–192; as well as his three articles, "De Quinatis e vita discussu," "Historia canonizationis Sancti Thomae de Aquino," and *Bulla Canonizationis S. Thomae Aquinatis a Ioanne IIXX P. Memorata notisque illustratu*, in *Xenia Thomistica* 3 (1925): 41–55; 105–172 and 173–188, respectively.

123. Gerson, *Opera omnia*, ed. Du Pin, t. 2, c 712, cited in André Vauchez, "Culture et sainteté d'après les procès de canonisation des XIII^e et XIV^e siècles," in *Le scuole degli ordini mendicanti (secoli XIII–SIV) 11–14 ottobre 1976*, Covegni del Centro di Studi sulla spiritualità medievale, 17 (Todi: Presso L'Accademia Tudertina, 1978): 162–164, ft. 2: "Cum in canonizatione sancti Thome de Aquino opponeretur a quibusdam quod non fecerat miracula vel non multa, dictum fuit per Papam non esse curandum et adiecit: quoniam tot miracula fecit quod determinavit quaestiones."

124. G. Meerssemann, "Concordia inter quatuor ordines mendicantes," *AFP* 4 (1934): 75–97.

125. Angelus Walz, "Papst Johannes XXII. und Thomas von Aquin. Zur geschichte der Heiligsprechung des Aquinaten," *Comm. St.*, I, 29–50.

126. Antoine Dondaine, "La collection des oeuvres de saint Thomas dite de Jean XXII et Jacuet Maci," *Scriptorium* 29 (1975): 127–152, and Angelus Walz, "Papst Johannes XXII und Thomas von Aquin," in *Comm. St.*: 29–50.

127. Claire le Brun-Gouanvic, "Contexte historique et littéraire de l'Ystoria sancti Thomae d'Aquino,"

12 and Franz Ehrle, *Historia Bibliothecae Romanorum Pontificum*, Biblioteca dell'Accademia storico-giuridica, 7 (Rome: Typis Vaticanis, 1890): 1: 144.–147.

128. *Acta*, 2, 123.

129. Tocco, *Vita*, 21: "... fraterculos de vita paupere, ut etiam sub hoc humilitatis sophistico nomine simplicium corda seducant, quos captos potius heretica pravitate fermentant. ..." and idem., *Ystoria Sanctii Thome de Aquino*, 142: "Et quia ex dictis abbatis Ioachim predicti heretici fomentum sumunt prefati erroris pestiferi, predictus doctor in quodam monasterio petium librum prefati abbatis et oblatum totum perlegit; et ubi erroneum aliquid reperit vel suspectum cum linea subducta dampnavi, quod totum legi et credi prohibuit quod ipse sua manu docta cassuit. Contra quem errorem pestiferum sanctissimus pater dominus Iohannes papa .XXII.^{us}, ad quem pertinet hereses condemnare, mirandum edidit deretalem, quorum errores, dum in ipsa descripsit, sacri canonis auctoritatibus potenter elisit."

130. Joseph Polzer, "'The triumph of Thomas' panel in Santa Caterina, Pisa. Meaning & date," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 37 (1993): 29–70. The library of the Dominican convent of Santa Catarina in Pisa is one of those rare blessings for scholars interested in medieval Dominican history. Not only did it host a number of influential friars (Thomas had taught there during the 1290's) but many of its records, chronicles, catalogs, manuscripts and incunabula are still extant. See Franz Pelster, "Bibliotheca Conventus Sanctae Catharinae Pisis. Collectio librorum ex temporibus S. Thomae Aquino," in *Xenia Thomistica* 3 (1925): 249–280. In addition, records of medieval provincial visitations to the convent are contained in the *Acta provinciae Romanae*.

131. Vauchez, "Les canonisations," 761. John XXII's bull unleashed a considerable backlash from the Spirituals and their followers, many of whom considered it a Veritable provocation.' See W. W. May, "The confession of Prous Boneta, heretic and heresiarch," in *Essays in medieval life and thought presented to Austin Patterson Evans*, ed. John Mundy (New York: 1955): 3–39.

132. Leonard Boyle, "The *Summa Confessorum* of John of Freiburg and the popularization of the moral teaching of St. Thomas and some of his contemporaries," in *Comm St.*, 245–268.

133. David d'Avray, "Sermons on the dead before 1350," *Studi Medievali* 31 (1990): 207–223.

134. *Acta*, 2, 64–65: "... quod nullus frater legendo, determinando, respondendo audeat assertive tenere contrarium eius, quod communiter creditur de opinione doctoris predicti, nec recitare aut confirmare aliquam singularem opinionem contra communem doctorum sententiam in hiis ... Quod si ex talibus opinionibus pertractatis scandalum sit subortum, volumus, quod acrius puniatur et ad revocandum nichilominus compellatur. Lectores quoque de textu biblie plus solito legant et in lectura de sentenciis ad minus tres vel quatuor articulos de doctrina de doctrina fratris Thome pertractent, prolixitate onerosa vitata. Nullus eciam studium Parisiense mittatur, nisi in doctrina fratris Thome saltem tribus annis studuerit diligenter."

135. Mulcahey, "First the bow," 157.

136. Durandus of St. Pourçain, Sent. II, Venice 1586, f. 423r, col. 2, cited in William J. Courtenay, "Programs of study and genres of scholastic theological production in the fourteenth century," in *Manuels, programmes*, 343, f. 37: "Siquidem, quod in primis dictaveram et scripseram, fuit a quibusdam curiosis mihi subreptum antequam fuisset per me sufficienter occectum. Propter quod hoc opus solum, quod per omnes libros incipit: 'Est Deus solus ...,' tamquam per me editum et correctum approbo."

137. Mulcahey, "Training of the *fratres communes*," 159.

138. *Annales Conventus S. Catharinae* cited in Polzer, "Triumph of Thomas," 31: "F. Jacobus Petri pisanus prioratu functus est anno 1342 ... Edificavit etiam unam aram sancti Thomae quum antea sola tabula ibi fuisset magna et nostri populi frequentia cum devotione ad Sancti auxilium implorandum concurrente, opus fuit aram statuere, etsi ad illud usque tempus nulla infra chorum fuisset. Dumque idem altare divo Antonio iuxta eandem dicat, cereas imagines multas que in miraculorum S. Thomae testimonium ibi appensae erant deposuit et vendidit, tuncque Pisis pius ad sacram memoriam affectus imminui cepit."

139. F. Bonaini, "Chronica antiqua conventus Sanctae Catharinae de Pisis," in *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, ser 3, 6 (1945), 523: "... recollegit auctoritates Bibliae et philosophorum a beato Thoma expositas per omnia opera sua. Doctrinam dicti doctoris, quam totam quasi mente tenebat, defendit ab impugnantibus magna cura. ..."

140. Senner, "Jean de Sterngassen," 84.

141. Torrell, *St. Thomas*, 308.

142. Trapp, "Augustinian theology," 264.

143. Marie-Dominique Chenu, "<<Maitre>> Thomas est-il une Autorité>>?" 187–194. For information on the Immaculate Conception controversy itself, see Wenceslaus Sebastian, "The controversy after Scotus to 1900," in *The dogma of the Immaculate Conception: history and significance*, ed. Edward O'Connor (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958): 213–270.

144. Trapp, “Augustinian theology,” 156–158.

145. Michael Tavuzzi, *Prierias: the life and works of Silvestro Mazzolini da Prierio, 1456–1527*, Duke monographs in medieval and renaissance studies 16 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997): 102–103.

NOTES TO CONCLUSION

1. Boyle, “Notes on the education,” in *Xenia Medii*.

2. Edouard-Henri Wéber, “L’ordine domenicano dal dibattito sul tomismo a Eckhart,” in *Storia della teologia nel medioevo*, vol. 3: *La teologia delle scuole*, ed. Giulio D’Onofrio (Casale Monferrato: Piemme, 1996), 405.

Works Cited

PRIMARY SOURCES

MANUSCRIPTS

- Durandus of St. Pourçain, "Epilogus postremi scripti in IV libros Sententiarum." Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1074 (f. 147r–148v). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- , "Quolibet Avenionensis I, quaestionem 3." Vat Lat. 1075 (f. 1r–15v). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- , "Quolibet Avenionensis II." Vat. Lat. 1075 (f. 15v–22v). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- , "Quodlibeti Parisiensis I." Vat. Lat. 1075 (f. 231v–38v). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- , "Quodlibeti Parisiensis I." Vat. Lat. 1076 (f. 13r–19r). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- , "Scriptum super I libro Sententiarum." Vat. Lat. 1072 (f. 1r–123r). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- , "Scriptum super IV libro Sententiarum." Vat. Lat. 1074 (f. 147r–148v; f. 287r–423r). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- , "Tractatus de habitus." Vat Lat. 1076 (f. 1r–9v). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- , "Utrum theologia dicat unum habitum tantum," Vat Lat 817 (f. 75r–80rb). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Hervaeus Natalis, "Defensio doctrinae fratris Thomae." Vat Lat 817 (f. 1r–75r). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- , "Quaestio de relatione contra Durandum," Vat Lat 772 (f. 157r–162r). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- , "Quaestiones Quodlibetales nonnullae." Vat Lat. 772 (f. 1r–121rb). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- , "Quattuor questiones theologicae." Vat Lat. 817 (75r–93r). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- , "Queretur in utrum in divinis relatio realiter differat ab essentia." Vat Lat. 817 (f. 182v–183f). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- , "Tractatus de relationibus." Vat Lat. 817 (f. 53r–70v). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Hervaeus Natalis, "Utrum in Deo sit relatio realis ad creaturam," in *De relatione contra Durandum*. Vat Lat 772 (f. 162v–164v). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Peter of Palude and John of Naples, "Articuli in quibus mgr. Durandus deviat a doctrina venerabilis doctoris nostri fratris." Vat Lat. 6736 (f. 113ra–113rb). Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.

ECCLESIASTICAL DOCUMENTS AND RECORDS

- "Acta canonizationis s. Dominici," ed. by Angelus Walz as pp. 91–194 in *Monumenta historica sancti patris nostri Domini*, 16 MOPH (1935): 146–147, no. 29.
- Acta capitulorum generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum ab anno 1220 usque ad annum 1 & 2*, ed. B. Reichert. *Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum historica*, 3–4. Romae: Ex typographia Polyglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1898–1904. Vol. 1: 1220–1323; vol.2: 104–1378.
- Acta capitulorum generalium: index alphabeticus*, B. Reichert. 2 vols. MOPH 1–2, Romae: s.n., 1952.
- Acta capitulorum provincialium ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum, Première province de province, Province romaine – Province d'Espagne (1239–1302)*, ed. Célestin Douais. Toulouse: É. Privat, 1895.
- Acta capitulorum prouincialium provinciae Romanae (1243–1344)*, ed. Thomae Kaeppli, Antoine Dondaine and Innocenzo Taurisano. MOPH 20. Romae: Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1941.
- "Acta capitulorum Provinciae Hispaniae a. 1390–93 celebratorum," ed. Thomas Kaeppli, AFP 38 (1968): 21–99.
- Bullarium ordinis fratrum praedicatorum*, ed. Thomas Ripoll and Antonio Bremond. Rome: Hieronymi Mainardi, 1729.
- Cartulaire; ou, Histoire diplomatique de St. Dominique*, ed. François Balme, Paul Lelalider and A. I. Collomb. 3 vols. (Paris: L'Année Dominicaine, 1893–1901).
- Catalogus Stamsensis scriptorum ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. G. Meersseman. MOPH 18. Romae: 1936.
- Catalogus Upsalensis scriptorum ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. G. Meersseman. MOPH 18. Romae: 1936.
- Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, ed. Henricus Denifle and Aemilio Chatelain. 4 vols. Parisiis: Ex Typis Fratrum Delalin, 1889–1897.
- Chronica et chronicorum excerpta historiam ordinis praedicatorum illustrantia*, ed. B. M. Reichert. MOPH 7. Rome: In domo generalitá, 1904.
- Compendium historiae ordinis praedicatorum*, compiled by Angelus Walz. Rome: Athenaeum, 1930.
- The Constitution of the Dominican Order, 1214–1360*, ed. Georgina R. Galbraith. Manchester: At the University Press, 1925.
- "Die Constitutionen de Predigerordens in der Redaction Raimunds von Penafort," ed. Henri Denifle, ALKGM 5 (1889): 553–564.
- Constitutiones antiquae ordinis Fratrum Pradicatorum* in A. H. Thomas, *De oudste Constituties van de Dominicanen: Voorgeschiedenis, Tekst, Bronnen, Ontstaan en Ontwikkeling (1215–1237)*, Bibliothèque de la Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique (Louvain, 1965).
- "Constitutions antique ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum," ed. Henri Denifle, ALKGM 1 (1885): 165–222.
- "Le Constitutions Generales Antique" dei Fratri Minori nella redazione Assisana del 1279," ed. G. Abate, *Miscellanea Francescana*, 35 (1935): 58–100.
- de Altamura, Ambrosio. *Bibliothecae Dominicanae: accuratis collectionibus, primo ab Ordinis constitutione, usque ad annum 1600 productae hoc seculari appartu*. Romae: Nicolae Angeli Tinassij, 1677.
- Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Norman P. Tanner, S.J.. 2 vols. London: Sheed & Ward: 1990.
- "Definitiones Capituli Generalis Argentinae celebrati anno 1282," ed. G. Fussenegger, AFH 26 (1933): 127–140.
- Early Dominicans: selected writings*, transl. and ed. Simon Tugwell. New York: Paulist Press, 1982.
- Fulk of Toulouse, "Lettre d'approbation de l'Ordre," in *Saint Dominique. La vie Apostolique, Chrétiens de tous les temps*, ed. Marie-Humbert Vicaire (Paris: Cerf, 1957), 151–152.
- Galuagni de la Flamma, *Chronica Ordinis*. MOPH 2.
- Gerald di Frachet's *Chronica ordinis, 1203–1496* in *Chronica et chronicorum excerpta historiam Ordinis Praedicatorum illustrantia*, ed. B. Reichert. MOPH 7. Romae: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S. C. De Propaganda Fide, 1904.
- Gerard di Frachet, *Vitae Fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum necnon Ordinis ab anno MXXIII usque ad annum MCCLIV*, ed. B.M. Reichert. MOPH 7. Rome: 1897.
- Humbert of Romans. *Regulations for the operation of a medieval library*. St. Paul, MN: Associates of the James Ford Bell Library, University of Minnesota, 1980; previously published in *The Library* 33 (1978): 47–50.
- . *Opera De vita regulari*, 2 vols., ed. J.J. Berthier. Paris, 1888; repr. Turin: Marietti, 1956.
- Jordan of Saxony. *Beati Iordani de Saxonia Epistulae*, ed. Angelus Walz. MOPH 23. Romae: Apud Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1951.
- . *Iordanis de Saxonia Opera ad res ordinis spectantia*, ed. B. Berthier. Friburg: Helvetiorum, 1981.

- . *Libellus de principiis ord. predicatorum*, ed. H. C. Scheeben. MOPH 26 Rome: 1935.
- . *Litterae encyclicae: annis 1233 et 1234 datae*, Biblioteca del Centro per il collegamento degli studi medievali e umanistici in Umbria 10. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto
- . *On the beginnings of the Order of Preachers*, ed. Simon Tugwell. Dominican Sources. Dublin: Dominican Publications, 1982.
- Die Konstitutionen des Predigerordens unter Jordan von Sachsen*, ed. Heribert Scheeben, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Dominikanerordens in Deutschland 38, 48–80. Koln: Albertus-Magnus Verlag, in Kommission bei Otto Harrassowitz, 1939.
- Litterae encyclicae magistrorum generalium ordinis praedicatorum ab anno 1233 usque ad annum 1376*. ed. B.M. Reichert and Andreas Früwith. MOPH 5. Rome: Santa Sabina, 1900.
- Miracula sancti Dominici mandato magistri Berengarii collecta; Petri Calo legendae sancti Dominici*, ed. Simon Tugwell. MOPH 26. Roma: Istituto Storico Domenicano, 1997.
- Monumenta diplomatia S. Dominici*, ed. Vladimer J. Koudelka and Raymundo J. Loenertz. MOPH 25. Romae: Apud Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1966.
- Monumenta historica sancti patris nostri Dominici*, ed. M.H. Laurent. 2 vols. MOPH 15–16. Romae ad S. Sabinae: Institutum Historicum FF. Praedicatorum, 1933.
- Pignon, Laurent. *Laurentii Pignon catologi et chronica; accedunt catologi stamsensis et upsalensis scriptorum O.P.*, ed. G. Meerseman. MOPH 18. Romae: apud S. Sabinae: apud Institutum historicum fratrum praedicatorum, 1936.
- Prediche all donne del secolo XIII: testi di Umberto da Romans, Gilberto da Tournai, Stefano di Borbone*, ed. C. Casagrande. Milan: Bompiani, 1978.
- “Processus canonizationis S. Dominici apud Bononiam,” ed. Angelus Walz. *MOPH* 16 (Rome: 1935).
- “Processus canonizationis S. Dominici apud Tholosam,” ed. Angelus Walz. *MOPH* 16 (Rome: 1935).
- Quétif, Jacques and Jacques Echard. *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum recensiti, notisque historicis et criticis*. 2 vols. in 4. New York: Burt Franklin, 1959.
- De scriptoribus scholasticis saeculi XIV ex Ordine Carmelitarum*, ed. B. Xiberta. Bibliothèque de la Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique 6. Louvain: Dominikanenkloster, 1931.
- “Statuta generali ordinis edita in capitulo generali an 1354 Assissii celebrato,” ed. Michael Bihl, *AFH* 35 (1936): 35–112; 177–253.
- St. Dominic: biographical documents*, trans. and ed. F. C. Lehner. Washington, D.C.: 1964.
- “Die Tabulae Ludwigs von Valladolid im Chor der Predigerbrüder von St. Jakob in Paris,” ed. H. Scheeben, *AFP* 1 (1931): 223–263.

DURANDUS OF ST. POURÇAIN: WORKS

- Durandus of St. Pourçain. *Disputationes Durandi et anonymi cuiusdam*, ed. Joseph Koch and Takeshiro Takada. Series of hitherto unedited texts of medieval thinkers 2. Kyoto: [s.n.], 1965.
- . *De Libero Arbitrio* in “Le “*Quaestiones de libero arbitrio*” di Durando da S. Porciano,” ed. Prospero T. Stella, *Salesianum* 3 (1962): 450–524.
- . *Quodlibeta Avenionensia tria, additis correctionibus Hervei Natalis supra dicta Durandi in primo Quolibet*, ed. Prospero T. Stella. Textus et studia in historiam scholasticae cura pontificii Athenaei Salesiani, 152–159. Zurich: Pas-Verlag, 1965.
- . *Tractatus de Habitibus (Q. 1–Q.3)*, ed. Takeshiro Takada. Series of hitherto unedited texts of medieval thinkers 1. Kyoto: Doshisha University, 1963.
- . *Tractatus de Habitibus: Quaestio Quarta [de subiectis habituum] addita quaestione critica anonymi cuiusdam ad fidem codicum manu scriptorum*, ed. Joseph Koch. Opuscula et Textus 8. Münster: Aschendorff, 1930.
- . *In Petri Lombardi sententias theologicas commentariorum libri IIII*. Venetiis: ex typographica Gueraea, 1571.
- . *Quaestio de natura cognitionis (II Sent. [a] d. 3 q. 5); et “Disputatio cum Anonymo quodam,”* ed. Joseph Koch. Opuscula et textus 6. Münster: Aschendorff, 1935.
- . *Quol. Paris I (Q. I–Q. IV)*, ed. Takeshiro Takada. Series of hitherto unedited texts of medieval thinkers 4. Kyoto: Doshisha University, 1968.

HERVAEUS NATALIS: WORKS

- Hervaeus Natalis, "Correctiones supra dicta Durandi de Sancto Porciano in Primo Quolibet," in Durandus of Saint Pourçain, *Quolibeta Avenionensia Tria*, ed. Prospero T. Stella. Textus et studia in historiam scholasticae 1, 293–326. Zürich: Pas-Verlag, 1965.
- . "Defensa doctrinae Divi Thomae," in *Theologie und Wissenschaft nach der Lehre der Hochscholastik. An der Hand der bisher ungedruckten Defensa doctrina D. Thomae des Hervaeus Natalis mit Begugung gedruckter und ungedruckter Paralleltext*, ed. Eugene Krebs, BGPMA, 11, Suppl. 3–4 (1912): 1–114.
- . *Hervei Natalis O.P. De Habitibus (Quaestiones Quodlibetales I, Q. 13 & 14)*, ed. Sho Yamazaki. Osaka, 1969.
- . "Die gegen Durandus gerichtete Streitschrift des Herveus Natalis <<De articulis pertinentibus ad primum Sententiarum Durandi>> (Art. 1–5)," ed. Takeshiro Takada in *Sapientiae procerum amore: Mélanges Médiévistes offerts à Dom Jean-Pierre Müller O.S.B. à l'occasion de son 70^{ème} anniversaire (24 février 1974)*, ed. Theodor W. Köhler. Studia Anselmiana 63, 439–456. Rome: Editrice Anselmiana, 1974.
- . "Opinio de difficultatibus contra doctrinam fratris Thome," ed. Paolo Piccari in *Disputa theologica devozione e utopia* (sec. XIV–XVI), Memorie Domenicane, ns. 26 (1995): 5–193.
- . *De relatione contra Durandum*, ed. Takeshiro Takada, Series of hitherto unedited texts of medieval thinkers 3. Kyoto: [s.n.], 1966.
- . *In quatuor Libros sententiarum Commentaria*, ed. Dionysius Moreau. Paris: Moreau, 1546; reprinted, Westmead: Gregg Press, 1966.
- . *Subtilissima Hervei Natalis Britonis theologi acutissimi quolibeta undecim cum octo ipsius profundissimis tractatibus infra per ordinem descriptis*, ed. M.A. Zimara. Venice: 1513; repr., Ridgewood, N.J.: Gregg, 1966.

OTHER SCHOLASTICS: WORKS

- Albert the Great. *Alberti Magni Physica, pars I (Libri 1–4)*, ed. P. Hossfeld, in *Opera Omnia ad fidem codicum manuscriptorum edenda, apparatu critico, notis prolegomenis, indicibus instruenda curavit Institutum Alberti magni Coloniense, Bernhardo Geyer praeside*, ed. W. Kübel (Monasterii Westfalum: In aedibus Aschendorff, 1951–), 4, pt. 1.
- . *Super Dionysii Mysticum Theologiam et Epistulas*, ed. P. Simon, in *Opera Omnia ad fidem codicum manuscriptorum edenda, apparatu critico, notis prolegomenis, indicibus instruenda curavit Institutum Alberti magni Coloniense, Bernhardo Geyer praeside*, ed. W. Kübel (Monasterii Westfalorum: In aedibus Aschendorff, 1951–), 37, pt. 2.
- Albert & Thomas: selected writings*, ed. Simon Tugwell. Classics of Western spirituality. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.
- Dietrich of Freiberg. *Treatise on the intellect and the intelligible*, ed. M. L. Führer, Mediaeval philosophical texts in translation 31. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1992.
- . *Opera omnia*. 1: *Schriften zur Intellekttheorie*, ed. Burkhardt Mojsich with an introduction by Kurt Flasch (Hamburg, 1977) and 2: *Schriften zur Metaphysik und Theologie*, ed. Ruedi Imbach, Maria Rita Pagnoni-Sturlese (Hamburg: 1980).
- Guilelmus de Tocco. *Ystoria sancti Thome de Aquino*, ed. Claire le-Brun-Gouanvic. Studies & texts, 127. Toronto: PIMS, 1996.
- Index Thomisticus: Sancti Thomae Aquinatis operum omnium indices et concordantiae in quibus verborum omnium et singulorum formae et lemmata cum suis frequentis et contextibus variis modis referuntur*, ed. Roberto Busa. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1974.
- Ioan de Pollico et Ioan de Neapoli. Quaestiones Disputatae De Immaculata Conceptione Beatae Mariae Virginis*, ed. C. Balić. Bibliotheca mariana Mariana Medii Aevi 1. Sibirnici: Kačić, 1931.
- Petrus de Palude. ... *In quartum sententiarum*. Venice: Beontum Locatellium Bergumensem, 1493.
- Peter of Bergamo. *In opera Sancti Thomae Aquinatis index; seu tabula aurea Eximii, editio fototypica*. Roma: Editiones Paulinae, 1880.
- William de al Mare. *Le Correctorium Corruptorii Quare*. Les premières polémiques thomistes 1, ed. P. Glorieux, Bibliothèque Thomiste 9. Kain: Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques, 1927.
- Vincentii Belvacensis: De Morali Principis Institutione*, ed. Robert J. Schneider. Corpus Christianorum – Continuatio Mediaevalis 137. Turnhout: Brepols.

MONOGRAPHS AND ARTICLES

- Ad litteram: authoritative texts and their medieval readers*, ed. Mark D. Jordan and Kent Emery, Jr. Notre Dame conferences in Medieval Studies 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992.
- Adel und Kirche: Gerd Tellenbach zum 65 Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern*, ed. Josef Fleckenstein und Karl Schmidt. Freiburg: Herder, 1968.
- Albertus Magnus Doctor Universalis 1280/1980*, ed. Gerbert Megyer and Albert Zimmermann. Walberberger Studien: Philosophisch Theologische Hochschule der Dominikaner. Mainz: Grünewald, 1980.
- Allen, E. B. "Hervaeus Natalis: an early "thomist" on the notion of being," *Medieval studies* 22 (1960): 1–14.
- Alverney, M.-T., "Un adversaire de St. Thomas: Petrus Iohannis Olivi," in *St. Thomas Aquinas, 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*, 2: 179–218. Toronto: PIMS, 1974.
- Amargier, Paul, "Le livre chez les prêcheurs dans la province de Provence au XIII^e siècle," in *Enseignement et vie intellectuelle (IX^e – XVI^e Siècle)*. Actes du 95^e Congrès National des Sociétés Savantes, Reims, 1970, Section de philologie et d'histoire jusqu'à 1610, 1, 405–417. Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1975.
- , et. al. "Panorama geografico, cronologico e statistico sulla distribuzione degli Studia degli ordini mendicanti," in *Le scuole degli ordini mendicanti*, 35–150.
- Aquinas and the problems of his time*, ed. G. Verbeke and D. Verhelst. Mediaevalia Lovaniensa 1. Louvain: Nijhoff, 1975.
- Arnau, Ramón, "La aportación de Durando de S. Porciano OP a la teología del sacramento del orden," *Escritos Vedat* 8 (1978): 95–121.
- Aron, Marguerite. *Saint Dominic's successor: The life of Blessed Jordan of Saxony, Master General of the Dominican Order, 1222–1327*. St. Louis: Herder, 1955.
- Ashley, Benedict. *The Dominicans*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Aspectus et affectus: essays and editions in Grosseteste and medieval intellectual life in honor of Richard C. Dales*, ed. Gunar Freibergs. AMS studies in the Middle Ages. New York: AMS Press, 1993.
- Aszattos, Monika, "The faculty of theology," in *Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. Hilde de Ridder-Symoens, A History of the University in Europe 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992): 409–441.
- Aus der Giesteswelt des Mittelalters: Studien und Texte Martin Grabmann zur vollendung des Lebensjahres von freunden und Schülern gewidemet*, ed. Albert Lang, Joseph Lechner, Michael Schmaus. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters: Texte und Untersuchungen, Suppl. 3., 2 vols. Münster: Aschendorff, 1935.
- Bataillon, Louis, "L'activité intellectuelle des Dominicains de la première génération," in *Lector et compiler: Vincent de Beauvais, frère prêcheur un intellectuel et son milieu au XIII^e siècle*, ed. Serge Lusignan, Monique Palmer-Foucart & Marie-Christine Duchesne, 9–19. Grâne: CNRS, 1997.
- , "Les conditions de travail des maîtres de l'université de Paris au XIII^e siècle," *RSPT* 67 (1983): 417–433.
- , "La diffusione manoscritta dei commenti biblici di San Tommaso d'Aquino," *Angelicum* 71 (1994): 579–590.
- , "Early scholastic and mendicant preaching as exegesis of Scripture," in *Ad litteram: authoritative texts and their medieval readers*, ed. Mark D. Jordan and Kent Emery Jr., Notre Dame Conferences in Medieval Studies 3, 172–175. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992.
- Bazan, B. "La quaestio disputata," in *Les genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales: Définition, critique, et exploitation*, ed. B. Bazan. Actes du Colloque international de Louvain-la-Neuve, 24–27 Mai, 1981, 31–50. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982.
- Bea, Augustin, "Deus auctor Sacra Scripturae. Herkunft und Bedeutung der Formel," *Angelicum* 20 (1943): 27–28.
- Bedouelle, Guy. *Saint Dominic: The Grace of the Word*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1987.
- Beilmeier, A., "Die Stellungnahme des Hervaeus Natalis, O.P., (1323) in der Frage nach dem Wissenschaftscharakter der Theologie," *Divus Thomas* 3 (1925): 399–414.
- Bennet, Ralph. *The early Dominicans: studies in thirteenth-century Dominican history*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1971.
- Berg, Dieter. *Armut und Wissenschaft: Beiträge zur geschichte des Studienwesens der Bettelorden im 13 Jahrhundert*, Geschichte und Gesellschaft 15. Düsseldorf: Padagogischer Verlag Schwann, 1977.
- Bérubé, C., "La première école scotiste," in *Preuve et raisons à l'université de Paris. Logique, ontologie et théologie au XIV siècle*, ed. Z. Kaluza and P. Vignaux, 9–24. Paris: Vrin, 1984.

- Beumer, Johannes von, "Schriftlose theologie? Zu den Prinzipien im Sentenzenkommentar des Hervaeus Natalis, O.P.," *Scholastik* 40 (1965): 398–404.
- , "Schrifttheologie in Theorie und Praxis: Nach dem Sentenzenkommentar des Durandus a Sancto Porciano, O.P.," *Scholastik* 40 (1965): 235–240.
- Bianchi, L. and E. Randi, "Le difficoltà di reportare," in *Filosofi e teologi; la ricerca e insegnamento nell'università medievale*, a cura di L. Bianchi, E. Randi, 53–54. Bergamo: Lubrina, 1989.
- Birkenmajer, Alexander, "Ad litteras Universitatis Parisiensis de obitu S. Thomae analecta nova," in *Xenia Thomistica*; vol. 3: Tractatus historico-criticos continens, 57–72. Rome: Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1925.
- Borst, Arno. *Die Kathares*. Freiburg: Herder, 1991.
- Bottin, F. "La polemica contro i moderni loyco (G. Di Ockham e N. di Autrecourt) nella Decas loyca di Leonino da Padova," *Medioevo* 4 (1978): 101–143.
- Bougerol, Jacques-Guy, "The Church Fathers and *auctoritates* in scholastic theology to Bonaventure," in *The reception of the church fathers in the West from the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. Irene Backus, 1: 289–336. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- , "A propos des condamnations parisiennes de 1241 et 1244," *AFH* 80 (1987): 462–466.
- Boyle, Leonard, "Notes on the education of the *fratres communes* in the Dominican Order in the thirteenth century," in his *Pastoral care, clerical education and canon law, 1200–1400* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1981): 157–179. Originally published as, "Notes on the education of the *fratres communes* in the Dominican Order in the thirteenth century," in *Xenia medii aevi historiam illustrantia oblata Thomae Kaeppli O.P.*, ed. Raymond Creyten and Pius Kiinzle, Storia e letteratura (Rome: 1979), 1: 249–267.
- , "The *Summa Confessorum* of John of Freiburg and the popularization of the moral teaching of St. Thomas and some of his contemporaries," in *Comm. St.*, 245–268.
- , "Summae confessorum," in *Les genres littéraires*. 227–238.
- Brady, I. "The development of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception in the fourteenth century after Aureoli," *FS* 15 (1944): 175–202.
- Brampton, C.K., "Personalities at the process against Ockham at Avignon, 1324–1326," *Franciscan studies annual* 4 (1966): 4–25.
- Brett, Edward, "The Dominican library in the thirteenth century," *Journal of library history* 15 (1980): 303–308.
- . *Humbert of Romans: his life and views of thirteenth-century society*, Studies and texts 67. Toronto: PIMS, 1984.
- Brek, M., *De evolutione iuridica studiorum in Ordine Minorem (ab initio Ordinis usque ad an 1517)*, Facultas de Urbe Iuris Canonici. Dubrovnik, Croatia: Pontificium Athenaeum Antonianum, 1942.
- Brinkley, Peter, "John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans," in *Centres of learning: learning and location in pre-modern Europe and the Near East*, ed. Jan Willem Drijvers and Alasdair MacDonald. Brill's studies in intellectual history 61, 255–67. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Brook, Christopher, "St. Dominic and his first biographer," in *Medieval Church and society: collected essays*, 214–232. London: Sidu, 1971.
- Brown, Stephen, "Henry of Ghent's critique of Aquinas' subalternation theory and the early Thomistic response," in *Knowing and the sciences in medieval philosophy*, ed. R. Työriöja, et al., Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of medieval philosophy, Helsinki 24–29 August 1987, 3: 337–345. Helsinki: 1990.
- , "Henry of Ghent's "De reductione artium ad theologiam," in *Thomas Aquinas and his legacy*, ed. David M. Gallagher. Studies in philosophy and the history of philosophy 39, 194–206. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1994.
- , "Key terms in medieval theological vocabulary," in *Méthodes et instruments du travail intellectuel au moyen âge: études sur le vocabulaire*, éd. Olga Weijers, Etudes sur le Vocabulaire Intellectuel du Moyen Age 3. Turnhout: Brepols, 1990.
- Bucichowski, W., "Le principe d'individuation dans la question de Henri de Lubek "Utrum materia sit principium individuationis," in *MPP* 21 (1975): 89–113.
- Burbach, Maurice, "Early Dominican and Franciscan legislation regarding St. Thomas," *Medieval studies* 4 (1942): 139–158.
- Burner, Fritz, "Studentenverzeichnisse der Dominikanerprovinz Saxonien, ca. 1277," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 44 (1925): 490–504.
- Burr, David, "The *Correctorium* controversy and the origins of the *Usus Pauper* controversy," *Speculum* 60 (1985): 331–342.
- Callebaut, A., "Jean Pecham O.F.M. et l'Augustinisme," *AFH* 18 (1925): 441–472.
- Callus, Daniel. *The Condemnation of St. Thomas at Oxford*. Westminster, MD: Newman Bookshop, 1946.

- , “The problem of unity of form and Richard Knapwell,” in *Mélanges offerts à Étienne Gilson*, 123–160. Toronto: PIMS, 1959.
- The Cambridge history of later medieval philosophy: from the rediscovery of Aristotle to the disintegration of scholasticism, 1100–1600*, ed. Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny and Jan Pinburg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Catto, Jeremy, “Theology and theologians 1220–1320,” in *The early Oxford schools*, ed. Jeremy Catto, The history of the University of Oxford 1: 471–518. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- Cenci, C., “Biblioteca e Bibliofili Francescani a tutto il secolo XV,” *Picenum Seraphicum* 8 (1971): 66–90.
- Centres of learning: learning and location in pre-modern Europe and the Near East*, ed. Jan William Drijvers and Alasdair MacDonald. Brill’s studies in intellectual history 61. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Cerquiglini-Toulet, Jacqueline. *The color of melancholy: the uses of books in the fourteenth century*, transl. Lydia G. Cochrane. Baltimore, MD.: Parallax, 1997.
- Cessario, Romanus, “Saint Thomas, Durand de Saint-Pourçain et Capreolus: le débat sur la foi,” in *Jean Capreolus en son temps (1380–144)*, ed. Guy Bedouelle, Romanus Cessario & Kevin White. Mémoire Dominicaine, numéro spécial 1, 159–164. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1997.
- Châtillon, Jean. *Le mouvement canonial au Moyen Age. Réform de l’Eglise, Spiritualité et Culture*, Etudes réunies par Patrice Sicard. Paris: Brepols, 1992.
- Chenu, Marie-Dominique, “Antiqui, moderni. Notes de lexicographie médiévale,” *RSPT* 17 (1928): 82–94.
- , “Autor, Actor, Autor,” *Bulletin du Cange* 3 (1927): 81–85.
- , “<<Maitres>> Thomas est-il une <<Autorité>>?: Note sure deux lieux théologiques au XIV^e siècle,” *Revue Thomiste* 30 (1925): 187–194.
- , *Nature, man and society in the twelfth century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- , “La première diffusion du Thomisme à Oxford, Knapwell et ses notes sur les Sentences,” *AHDLMA* 3 (1928): 185–200.
- , *La théologie au XII^e siècle*, Études de philosophie médiévale 45. Paris: J. Vrin, 1958.
- , *La théologie comme science XIII^e siècle*, Bibliothèque Thomiste 33. Paris: J. Vrin, 1957.
- , *Towards understanding St. Thomas*, trans. A.M. Landry and D. Hughes. Chicago: Regnery, 1964: [originally published as *Introduction à l’étude de saint Thomas d’Aquin*].
- Church, society and politics: papers read at the thirteenth summer meeting and the fourteenth winter meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. Derek Baker. Studies in Church history 12. Oxford: Blackwell, 1975.
- Cobban, Alan. *The medieval universities: their development and organization*. London: Methuen & Co., 1975.
- Colish, Marcia, “Quae hodie locum non habent: scholastic theologians reflect upon their authorities,” in *Proceedings of the PMR Conference 15*, ed. P. Pulsiano, 1–17. Villanova, PA: Villanova University Press, 1990.
- , “Teaching and learning theology in medieval Paris,” in *Schools of thought in the Christian tradition*, ed. Patrick Henry, 106–124. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Colledge, Edmund, “The legend of St. Thomas Aquinas,” *Comm. St.*, 1, 13–28.
- Conforti, Patrizia, “Hervé de Nédellec et les questions ordinaires *De cognitione primi principii*,” *RT* 97 (1997): 63–82.
- Congar, Yves, “Aspects ecclésiologiques de la querelle entre mendiants et séculiers dans la seconde moitié du XIII^e et XIV^e siècle,” *AHDLMA* 8 (1961): 35–151.
- , “In dulcedine societatis quaerere veritatem” – Notes sur le travail en équipe chez les Prêcheurs au XIII^e siècle,” in *Albertus Magnus Doctor Universalis 1280/1980*, ed. Gerbert Megyer and Albert Zimmermann. Walberberger Studien: Philosophisch Theologische Hochschule der Dominikaner, 47–58. Mainz: Grünewald, 1980.
- , “Pour une histoire sémantique du terme ‘magisterium,’” *RSPT* 60 (1976): 88–98.
- Contemporary reflections on the medieval Christian tradition: essays in honor of Ray C. Petry*, ed. George H. Shriver. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1974.
- Courtenay, William, “Programs of study and genres of scholastic theological production in the fourteenth century,” in *Manuels, programmes*, 325–350.
- , *Schools & scholars in fourteenth-century England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- , *Teaching careers at the University of Paris in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries*. Texts and studies in the history of medieval education 12. Notre Dame: U.S. Subcommittee for the History of Universities, 1988.
- Cremascoli, G., “Il ‘Libellus de visione dei’ di Durando di S. Porziano,” *Studi Medievali* 25 (1984): 393–443.
- Creytens, Raymond, “Autour de la littéraire des correctoires,” *AFP* 12 (1942): 313–330.

- , "L'instruction des novices dominicains au XIII^e siècle d'après le ms. Toulouse 418," *AFP* 20 (1950): 114–193.
- , "Le Studium Romanae Curiae" et le Maître du Sacre Palais," *AFP* 12 (1942): 5–83.
- , "Le <<Testament de S. Dominique>> dans la littérature Dominicaine ancienne et moderne," *AFP* 43 (1973): 29–72.
- Cunningham, Francis. *Essence and existence in Thomism: a mental vs. the "real distinction?"* Lanham: University of America Press, 1988.
- D'Amato, A., "Bombologna da Bologna," *Sapienza* 1 (1948): 81–83.
- Davies, Brian, "Is sacra doctrina theology?" *New Blackfriars* 71 (1990): 141–147.
- . *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Davis, Charles T. "Remigio de' Girolami, O.P., (d. 1319) lector of S. Maria Novella in Florence," in *Le scuole degli ordini mendicanti*: 281–304.
- d'Avray, David. *The Preaching of the Friars: sermons diffused from Paris before 1300*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- , "Sermons on the dead before 1350," *Studi Medievali* 31 (1990): 207–223.
- Davy, M.M. *Les sermons universitaires Parisiens de 1230–1231*. Études de Philosophie médiévale 15. Paris: Vrin, 1931.
- Day, Sebastian. *Intuitive cognition: a key to the significance of the later scholastics*, Franciscan Institute Publications, Philosophy series, 4. St. Bonaventure, N.Y.: Franciscan Institute, 1947.
- Decker, Bruno. *Die Gotteslehre des Jakob von Metz: Untersuchungen zur Dominikanertheologie zu Beginn des 14. Jahrhunderts*. BGPMA 42 (1967).
- Delcorno, Carlo, "Origini dell predicazione francescana," in *Francesco d'Assisi e francescanesimo dal 1216 al 1226. Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale, Assisi 1976*, Testimonianze sull' ebraismo, 1 (Assisi: Rome: B. Caracci, 1978), 127–166.
- , "Rassegna di studi sulla predicazione medievale e umanistica (1970–80)," *Lettere italiana* (1981): 253–276.
- Di Napoli, G., "Gioacchino da Fiore e Pietro Lombardo," *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* 71 (1979): 127–152.
- A distinct voice: medieval studies in honor of Leonard E. Boyle, O.P.*, ed. Jacqueline Brown and William P. Stoneman. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997.
- Dondaine, Anton, "La collection des oeuvres de saint Thomas dite de Jean XXII et Jacuet Maci," *Scriptorium* 29 (1975): 127–152.
- , "Un commentaire scripturaire de Roland de Cremona, 'Le Livre de Job,'" *AFP* 11 (1941): 109–137.
- , "La hiérarchie cathare en Italie," *AFP* 19 (1949): 280–312; 20 (1950): 234–324.
- , "Venerabilis Doctor," in *Mélanges offerts à Étienne Gilson de l'Académie Française*, 211–225. Toronto: PIMS; Paris, Vrin, 1959.
- d'Onofrio, Guilio, "Theological ideas and the idea of theology in the early Middle Ages," *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 38 (1991): 273–297.
- Donneaud, H., "M.-D. Chenu et la théologie comme science au XIII^e siècle," *Mémoire dominicaine* 4 (1994): 139–175.
- Douais, Célestin, "Assignations des livres aux religieux du convent des Frères Prêcheurs de Barcelona (XIII^e-XIV^e siècles)," *Revue des bibliothèques* 3 (1893): 49–83.
- . *Essai sur l'organizon des études dans l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs au XIII^e et au XIV^e siècle*. Paris: Picard, 1884.
- . *Les Frères Prêcheurs en Gascogne au XIII^e et au XIV^{me} siècle. Chapitres, couvents et notices: documents inédits*. 3 v. in 2. Archives historiques de la Gascogne 7–8. Paris-Auch: H. Champion, 1885.
- Douie, Decima. *The conflict between the seculars and mendicants at the University of Paris in the thirteenth century*. London: Aquinas Society, 1954.
- Dufeil, M.-M., *Guillaume de Saint-Amour et la polémique universitaire parisienne, 1250–1259*. Paris: Picard, 1972.
- Dumont, Camillo, S.J. *La théologie comme science chez les Scolastiques du Treizième Siècle: histoire de la question <<Utrum theologia sit scientia>> de 1230 a 1320*. Louvain: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1962.
- Duval, André, "L'étude dans la législation religieuse de Saint Dominique," in *Mélanges offerts à M.-D. Chenu*. Paris: Vrin, 1967.
- Duvernoy, Jean. *La religion des Cathares*. Toulouse: Privat, 1976.
- . *L'histoire des Cathares*. Toulouse: Privat, 1979.
- The early Oxford schools*, ed. Jeremy Catto. The history of the University of Oxford 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

- Ehrle, Franz, "Arnaldo de Villanova ed i "Thomatiste," *Gregorianum* 1 (1920): 475–501.
- , *Historia Bibliothecae Romanorum Pontificum*. Biblioteca dell'Accademia storico-giuridica 7. Rome: Typis Vaticanis, 1890.
- , "John Peckham über den Kampf des Augustinismus und Aristotelismus in der zweiten Hälfte des XIII Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 13 (1889): 172–193.
- , "Der Kampf um die Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin in den ersten fünfzig Jahren nach seinem Tode," *ZKT* 37 (1913): 266–318.
- , *I più antichi statuti della facoltà teologica dell' università di Bologna*. Bologna, 1923.
- Elders, Leo J., "Thomas Aquinas and the Fathers of the Church," in *The reception of the church fathers in the West: from the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. Irena Backus with Antoinina Bevan. Leiden: New York: Brill, 1997.
- Elter, P., "Un ouvrage inconnu de Hervé Nédellec," *Gregorianum* 4 (1923): 211–240.
- Emery, R. W. *The Friars in Medieval France. A catalogue of French mendicant convents, 1200–1550*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.
- Emmen, A., "De origine controversiae circa peccatum originale in schola dominican saeculo XIII. Relationes inter Jacobum Metensem et Durandum illustratae ex operibus Duns Scoti et Guillelmi de Nottingham," *Divus Thomas* (1943): 385–400.
- Enseignement et vie intellectuelle (IX^e – XVI^e Siècle)*. Actes du 95^e Congrès National des Sociétés Savantes, Reims, 1970, Section de philologie et d'histoire jusqu'à 1610. Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1975.
- The eternity of the world in the thought of Thomas Aquinas and his contemporaries*, ed. J. Wissink. Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters. Leiden: Brill, 1990.
- An Etienne Gilson Tribute*, ed. C. J. O'Neal. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1959.
- Evans, G. R., "Exegesis and authority in the thirteenth century," in *Ad litteram: authoritative texts and their medieval readers*, ed. Mark D. Jordan and Kent Emery, Jr. Notre Dame Conferences in Medieval Studies 3 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992): 93–112.
- , *The language and logic of the Bible: the earlier Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- , "Theology: the vocabulary of teaching and research 1300–1600: words and concepts," in *Vocabulary of teaching and research between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. Olga Weijers. Etudes sur le vocabulaire intellectuel du Moyen Age 7, 118–133. Turnhout: Brepols, 1995.
- Fallon, Timothy. "The notion of truth in Hervaeus Natalis." Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1966.
- Féret, Henri M. *La faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres, Moyen Âge*. 4 vols. Paris: Picard, 1894–1897.
- , "Vie intellectuelle et vie scolaire dans l'Ordre de Prêcheurs," *Archives d'histoire dominicaine* 1 (1946): 5–27.
- Ferrua, Vincent, "I fratri predicatori a Torino. Dall'insediamento a tutto il secolo XIV," *Bolletino storico-bibliografico subalpino* 90 (1992): 111–165.
- Ferruolo, S. *The origins of the universities: the schools of Paris and their cities*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985.
- , "The Statutes of 1215 Reconsidered," *History of the universities* 5 (1985): 1–95.
- Filosofia e teologia nel trecento: studi in ricordo di Eugenio Randi*, ed. Luca Bianchi. Textes et Études du Moyen Âge. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1994.
- Filthaut, Ephrem. *Roland von Cremona O.P. und die Anfänge der Scholastik im Predigerorden*. Köln: Albertus-Magnus-Verlag, 1936.
- Finke, Heinrich. *Ungedruckte Dominikanerbriefe des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1891)
- Fletcher, John and Julian Deahl, "European universities, 1300–1700: the development of research, 1969–1981," in *Rebirth, Reform and Resilience*, ed. James Kittleson, 324–357. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984.
- Fournier, P., "Durand de Saint-Pourçain," *HLF* 37 (1938): 1–38.
- Francesco d'Assisi e francescanesimo dal 1216 al 1226. Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale, Assisi 1976*, Testimonianze sull'ebraismo 1. Assisi: Rome: B. Caracci, 1978.
- Frank, Isnard, "Hausstudium und Universitätsstudium der Wiener Dominikaner bis 1500," *Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte* 127 (Vienna, 1968).
- , "Zur studien organisation der Dominikanerprovin Teutonia in der ersten Hälfte des 14 Jahrhunderts; und zum studiengang des Seilegen Heinrich Seuse, O.P.," in *Heinrich Seuse: Studien zum 600 Todestag, 1366–1966*, ed. E. M. Filthaut, 39–69. Köln: Albertus Magnus, 1966.
- Freud, J. B. *The Friars and German society in the thirteenth century*. Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy, 1977.

- Fries, A., "Quaestiones super quantum librum sententiarum Hervaei Natali OP vindicatae," *Angelicum* 13 (1936): 498–533.
- Fumagalli, Maria Beonio-Brocchieri, "Il 'De origine iurisdictionum' di Durando di S. Porciano," *Rivista di Filosofia neo scolastica* 14 (1978): 193–206.
- . *Durando di S. Porciano. Elementi filosofici della terza redazione del "Commento alle Sentenze ..."* Firenze: La nuova Italia Edictrice, 1969.
- . "Note sul concetto di teologia in Durando di S. Porciano," in *Filosofia e teologia nel trecento: studi in ricordo di Eugenio Randi*, ed. Luca Bianchi. Textes et Études du Moyen Âge, 57–64. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1994.
- Gabriel, Astrik, "The ideal master of the medieval university," *Catholic Historical Review* 9 (1974): 1–40.
- Galbraith, Georgina R. *The Constitution of the Dominican Order, 1215–1360*. Manchester: At the University, 1925.
- Garcia, Jorge J. E., "Scholasticism and scholastic method," *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, 10: 56.
- Gargan, Luciano. *Lo Studio teologico e la Biblioteca dei Domenicani a Padova nel Tre e Quattrocento*. Padova: Anetore, 1971.
- Gayba, B. P. *Aspects of the mediaeval history of theology: 12th to 14th centuries*. Studia originalia 7. Pretoria: University of South Africa Press, 1988.
- Gauthier, R. A., "Les 'Articuli' in quibus frater Thomas melius in Summa quam Scriptis," *RTAM* 19(1952): 271–326.
- Gelber, Hester Goodenough, "Logic and the Trinity: a clash of values in scholastic thought," Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1974.
- Les genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales: Définition, critique, et exploitation*, Acts du Colloque international de Louvain-la-Neuve, 25–27 Mai, 1981. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982.
- Gerulaitis, Leonardus V., "The canonization of Saint Thomas Aquinas," *Vivarium* 5 (1967): 25–46.
- Gilson, Etienne. *History of Christian philosophy in the middle ages*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1955.
- de Ghellinck, J. *Le mouvement theologique du XII^e siècle: Sa préparation lointaine avant et autour de Pierre Lombard, ses rapports avec les initiatives des canonistes; études, recherches et documents*. Bruges: Éditions "De Tempel", 1948.
- Glorieux, Palemon, "Le conflit de 1252–1257 à la lumière du mémoire de Guillaume de Saint-Amour," *RTAM* 24 (1957): 364–372.
- . "L'enseignement au moyen âge. Techniques et méthodes en usage à la Faculté de Théologie de Paris, au XIII^e siècle," *AHDLMA* 35 (1968): 65–186.
- . "La faculté de Paris et ses Principaux docteurs au XII^e siècle," *Revue d'histoire de l'église de France* 32 (1946): 241–264.
- . "La littérature des correctoires: simples notes," *Revue thomiste* 33 (1928): 69–96.
- . *La littérature quodlibétique*, 2 vols. Bibliothèque thomiste 5, 21. Kain: Le Saulchoir, 1925–35.
- . "Jean Quidort et la distinction réelle de l'essence et de l'existence," *RTAM* 18 (1951): 151–157.
- . "Pro et contra Thomam. Un survol de cinquante années," in *Sapientiae procerum amore: Mélanges Médiévistes offerts à Dom Jean-Pierre Müller*, ed. Theodor Köhler, 255–288. Romae: Anselmiana, 1974.
- . *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIII^e siècle* 17 (Paris: 1933–4). Additions by V. Doucet in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 27 (1935): 531–564.
- Grabmann, Martin, "Albert von Brescia OP (+1314) und sein Werk "De officio sacerdotis"," *Divus Thomas* (Freiburg, 1940): 5–38.
- . "Circa historiam distinctionis essentiae et existentiae," *Acta Pont. Academiae Romanae S. Thomas Aq. Et Religionis Catholicae*, ns 1 (1934): 41–58.
- . "Le 'Correctorium corruptorii' de dominicain Johannes Quidort de Paris (+1306)," *Revue néo-scholastique* (Louvain) 19 (1912): 404–418.
- . "Forschungen zur Geschichte der ältesten deutschen Thomistenschule des Dominikanerordens," *Xenia Thomistica* 3 (1925): 189–231.
- . "Die Kanonisation des hl. Thomas von Aquin in ihre Bedeutung für die Ausbreitung und Verteidigung seiner Lehre im 14 Jahrhundert," *Divus Thomas* 1 (1923): 233–249.
- . "La scuola tomistica Italiana nel XIII e principio del XIV secolo: Ricerche sui Manoscritti," *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* 15 (1923): 99–155.
- . "De Summae D. Thomae Aquinatis theologiae studio in ordine fratrum Praedicatorum jam saeculis xiii et xiv vigente," in *Miscellanea Dominicana in memoriam vii anni saecularis ab obitu Sancti Patris dominici 1221–1921* Rome, 1923.
- Griesbach, M., "John of Paris as a representative of thomistic political philosophy," in *An Etienne Gilson*

- tribute, ed. C.J. O'Neal, 33–50. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1959.
- Guimarães, A. de, "Hervé Noël (1323): Étude Biographique," *AFP* 8 (1938): 5–81.
- Guimares, F. de, "La doctrine des théologiens sur l'Immaculée Conception de 1250 à 1350," *Études franciscaines*, ns 2, 9 (Dec., 1952): 181–205; 4 (June, 1953): 167–197.
- Gy, P., "Le statut ecclésiologique de l'apostolat des Prêcheurs et des Mineurs avant la querelle des Mendians," *RSPT* 59 (1975): 79–88.
- Ham, Edward B. *Rutebeuf and Louis IX*, University of North Carolina studies in the Romance Languages and Literature, 42. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962.
- Hamesse, Jacqueline, "Les florilèges philosophiques du XIII^e au XVe siècle," in *Les genres littéraires*, 151–192.
- , "Le vocabulaire des florilèges médiévaux," in *Méthodes et instruments du travail intellectuel au moyen âge: Etudes su le vocabulaire*, ed. Olga Weijers. Turnhout: Brepols, 1990.
- Hanssler, Michael, "Katharismus in Süddeutschland. Struktur der Sekte und inquisitorische Verfolgung in der zweiten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts," Ph.D. diss., Regensburg University, 1991.
- Haureau, B. "Hervé Nédélec, Général de Frères Prêcheurs," *HLF* 34: 308–315.
- Heinrich Seuse: *Studien zum 600 Todestag, 1366–1966*, ed. E.M. Filthaut. Köln: Albertus Magnus, 1966.
- Henninger, Mark. *Relations: medieval theories, 1250–1325*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- , "Some late medieval theories of the category of relations," Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA, 1983.
- Hillenbrand, Eugen, "Kurie und Generalkapitel des Predigerordens unter Johannes XXII. (1316–1334)," in *Adel und Kirche: Gerd Tellenbach zum 65 Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern*, ed. Josef Fleckenstein und Karl Schmidt, 499–515. Freiburg: Herder, 1968.
- Hinnebusch, William. *Brève histoire de l'Ordre dominicain*. Paris: de Cerf, 1990.
- , *The early English Friars Preachers*. Dissertationes Historicae 14. Rome: Institutum Historicum FF Praedicatorum, 1951.
- , "The English Dominicans and the masters general of the late fourteenth century," in *Xenia medii aevi historiam*, ed. R. Creyten and P. Kunzle (1978): 457–469.
- , *History of the Dominican Order*. 2 vols. New York: Alba House, 1966.
- Hoenen, Martin, "The literary reception of Thomas Aquinas' view on the provability of the eternity of the world in de la Mare's *Correctorium* (1278–9) and the *Correctoria Corruptorii* (1279–ca. 1286)," in *The eternity of the world in the thought of Thomas Aquinas and his contemporaries*, ed. J. Wissink. Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 39–68. Leiden: Brill, 1990.
- Hödl, Ludwig, "Die Grundfragen der Sakramentenlehre nach Hervaeus Natalis O.P. (1323)," *Münchener Theologische Studien* 10 (Munich, 1956).
- , "Quaestio, Quaestioneliteratur," *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* 8, coll. 925–928.
- , "Die Quodlibeta minora des Hervaeus Natalis," *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift*, 6 (1955): 215–229.
- Horst, Ulrich. *Evangelische Armut und Kirche. Thomas von Aquin und die Armutskontroversen des 13. und beginnenden 14. Jahrhunderts*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Dominikanerordens, NF 1. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1992.
- , "Mendikant und Theologie. Thomas v. Aquin in den Armutsbewegungen seiner Zeit (zu Contra retrahentes c. 15)," *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 47 (1996): 13–31.
- Hsü, A. *Dominican presence in the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus: A study of Dominican influence of the textual make-up of the Jesuit Constitutions in regard to the formation of novices and the rules for the novice master*. Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1971.
- Hubert, P., "Auctoritas," *Bulletin du Cange* 34 (1964): 101–124.
- Imbach, Rudi, "L'antithomisme de Thierry de Freiberg," *Revue thomiste* 97 (1997): 245–258.
- , "Gravis iactura verae doctrinae. Prolegomena zu einer Interpretation der Schrift *De ente et essentia* Dietrichs von Freiberg, O.P.," *FZPT* 26 (1979): 369–425.
- , "(Néo)platonisme médiévale, Proclus latin et l'école dominicaine allemande," *RSPT* 110 (1978): 427–448.
- , "Prétendue primauté de l'être sur le connaître. Perspectives cavalières sur Thomas d'Aquin et l'école dominicaine allemand," in *Lectionum varietates. Hommage à Paul Vignaux*, ed. Jean Jolivet, Z. Kaluza and Charles Pietri. Études de Phil. Médiévale 65, 121–132. Paris Vrin, 1991.
- Imbach, R., and U. Lindblad, "Compilatio rudis ac puerilis. Hinweise und Materialien zu Nicolaus von Strassburg und seiner Summa," *FZPT* 32 (1985): 122–155.
- Izbicki, Thomas, "Infallibility and the erring pope: Guido Terreni and Johannes de Turrecremata," in *Law, Church and society: essays in honor of Stephan Kuttner*, ed. K. Pennington and R. Sommerville. The Middle Ages, 97–111. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.
- Jacquín, M., "Bulletin d'histoire des doctrines Chrétiennes," *RSPT* 7 (1931).

- Janssens, E., "Les premiers historiens de la vie Saint Thomas d'Aquin," *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie* 26 (1924): 201–214; 325–352; and 452–476.
- Janz, Dennis, "Towards a definition of late medieval Augustinianism," *The Thomist* 44 (1980): 117–127.
- Jean Capreolus en son temps (1380–1444), ed. Guy Bedouelle, Romanus Cessario & Kevin White. Mémoire Dominicaine, numéro spécial 1. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1997.
- Jeffry, Evan Brover, "Medieval theories of relations before Aquinas; categories commentaries A.S. 510–1250," Ph.D. diss., University of Iowa, 1996.
- Jordan, Mark D., "The controversy of the *Correctia* and the limits of metaphysics," *Speculum* 57 (1982): 292–314.
- Kaeppeli, Thomas, "Antiche biblioteche domenicane in Italia," *AFP* 36 (1966): 5–80.
- , *Inventari di libri di San Domenico de Perugia (1430–1480)*. Rome: 1952.
- , "Le process contre Thomas Waleys, OP," (Rome 1936) 29.
- Kelley, Francis, "Some observations on Ockham's *factum* theory and *esse objectivum* in Hervaeus Natalis," *Franciscan Studies* 38 (1978): 260–282.
- , "Thomas Sutton's place in the development of Aristotelianism and Thomism at Oxford in the last quarter of the thirteenth century," B. Litt. Thesis, Oxford, 1966.
- , "The Thomists and their opponents at Oxford in the last part of the thirteenth century," Ph.D. diss., Oxford University, 1977.
- , "Two early English Thomists, Thomas Sutton and Robert Orford vs. Henry of Ghent," *The Thomist* 45 (1981): 345–387.
- Kenny, Anthony. *Aquinas: a collection of critical essays*, ed. Anthony Kenny. Modern studies in philosophy. Garden City: Anchor, 1976.
- Kenny, Anthony and Jan Pinborg, "Medieval philosophical literature," in *Cambridge history of later medieval philosophy: from the rediscovery of Aristotle to the disintegration of scholasticism, 1100–1600*, ed. Norman Kretzmann, et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Knowledge and the sciences in medieval philosophy*, ed. R. Työrinöja, et al. 3 vols. Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Medieval Philosophy, Helsinki 24–29 August 1987. Annals of the Finnish society for Missiology and Ecumenics 55. Helsinki: Finnish Society for Missiology and Ecumenics, 1990.
- Knowles, David. *The historical context of the philosophical works of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Aquinas paper 30. London: Blackfriars, 1958.
- , *The religious orders in England*. 3 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1994–1959.
- Knowles, David and R. Neville Hadcock, *Medieval religious houses: England and Wales* (London: Longmans, Green, 1953).
- Koch, Joseph. *Durandus of S. Porciano, O.P.: Forschungen zum Streit um Thomas von Aquin zu Beginn des 14. Jahrhunderts*, Beiträge Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters 26. Münster: Aschendorff, 1927.
- , "Die Jahre 1312–1317 im Leben des Durandus de Sancto Porciano O. Pr.," in *Per la storia della Teologia e della Filosofia*, Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle 1, Studi e testi 37, 265–306. Rome: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1924.
- , "Jakob von Metz OP., der Lehrer des Durandus de S. Porciano," *AHDLM* 4 (1929/30): 169–198.
- , *Kleine Schriften*. 2 vols. Storia e Letteratura Raccolta di Studi e Testi. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1973.
- , "Kritische Studien zum Leben Meister Eckharts," *AFP* 29 (1929): 5–51; 30 (1960): 5–52.
- , "Die Magister-Jahre des Durandus de S. Porciano, O.P. und der Konflikt mit seinem Orden," in *Kleine Schriften*, 2: 7–118.
- , "Neue Aktenstücke zu dem gegen Wilhelm Ockham in Avignon Geführten Prozess," *RTAM* 7 (1935): 350–380; and *RTAM* 8 (1936): 79–93; 168–197.
- , "Ein neuer Zeuge für die gegen Durandus de S. Porciano gerichtete thomistische Irrtumsliste," in *Kleine Schriften*, 2: 119–126.
- , "Der Prozess gegen den Magister Johannes de Polliaco und seine Vorgeschichte," *RTAM* 5 (1933): 392–422.
- , "Die Verteidigung der theologie des Hl. Thomas von Aquin durch den Dominikanerorden gegenüber Durandus de S. Porciano, O. Pr.," *Xenia Thomistica* 3 (Rome, 1925): 327–362.
- , "Zu codex 24 des Archivo del Cabildo catedral de Barcelona," *AFP* 13 (1943): 101–107.
- Köhler, Theodore. *Der Begriff der Einheit und ihr ontologisches Prinzip nach dem Sentenzenkommentar der Jakob von Metz, OP*. Studia Anselmiana 58. Rome: Herder, 1971.
- , "Wissenschaft und Evidenz. Beobachtungen zum wissenschaftstheoretischen Ansatz des Jakob von Metz," in *Sapientiae Procerum Amore*, Studia Anselmiana 63, 369–414. Rome: Anselmiana, 1974.

- Koppers, Apollonia. *Die Stellung der religiösen Orden su den Profanwissenschaften im 12 und 13 Jahrhunderts*. Freiburg: Kommissionsverlag der Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1914.
- Krebs, Eugene, "<<De esse et essentia>> de Thierry de Friberg," *Revue néo-scolastique* 18 (1911): 516–536.
- , *Meister Dietrich (Theodoricus Teutonicus de Vriber). Sein Leben, seine Werke, seine Wissenschaft*. BGPMA 5 (Münster, 1906).
- Krieger, Leonard, "The idea of authority in the West," *American Historical Review* 82 (1977): 249–270.
- Krempel, A. *La doctrine de la relation chez Saint Thomas: exposé historique et systématique*. Paris: Vrin, 1952.
- Kristellar, Paul Oskar, "Thomism and the Italian thought of the Renaissance," in *Medieval aspects of renaissance learning: three essays*, ed. Edward P. Mahoney, 29–95. New York: Columbia University Press, Morningside edition, 1992. Originally published Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1974.
- Krizovljan, Hadrianus, "Primordia Scholae Franciscanae et Thomismus," *Collectanea Franciscane* 31 (1961): 133–175.
- Kuttner, Stephan, "On 'Auctoritas' in the writing of medieval canonists: the vocabulary of Gratian," in *La Notion d'Autorité au Moyen Age: Islam, Byzances, Occident, Colloques Internationaux de la Napoules, 23–26 Octobre 1978*, ed. George Makdisi, Dominique Sourdél and Janine Sourdél Thomine, 69–81. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1982.
- Ladner, R., "Le nom et l'idée d'ordo Praedicatorum," in *St. Dominique, l'idée, l'homme et l'œuvre: augmenté de notes et d'études critiques par M. H. Vicaire*, ed. Pierre Mandonnet and R. Ladner, 2, 49–68. Paris: Desclée, de Brouwer, 1938.
- Landgraf, Artur Michel. *Introduction à l'histoire de la littérature théologique de la scolastique naissante*, éd. française Albert-M. Landry, trans. of *Einführung in die Geschichte der theologischen Literatur der Früh scholastik* by Louis-B. Gerger, Université de Montréal. Institut d'études médiévales. Publications, 22/22 Montréal: Paris: Institut d'études médiévales, 1973.
- Law, *Church, and society: essays in honor of Stephan Kuttner*, ed. Kenneth Pennington and Robert Sommerville. Pittsburgh: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.
- Lawless, George, O.S.A. *Augustine of Hippo and his monastic Rule*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Lawn, Brian. *Rise and decline of the scholastic Quaestio disputata: with special emphasis on its use in the teaching of medicine and science*. Education and society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 2. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Lawrence, C. H. *The Friars: The impact of the early mendicant movement on western society*. New York: Longman, 1994.
- Leclercq, Jean, "L'idéal du théologien au moyen âge: textes inédites," *Revue des sciences religieuses* 21 (1947): 121–148.
- , *The love of learning and the desire for God: a study of monastic culture*. 3rd ed. New York: Fordham University Press, 1982.
- , "Lo sviluppo dell'atteggiamento critico degli allievi verso i maestri dal X al XIII secolo," in *Università e società nei secoli XII–XVI, atti del non convegno internazionale di studio tenuto a Pistoia neigiorni 20–25 settembre 1979*. Pubblicazioni dell'Università cattolica del sacro cuore. Miscellanea del Centro di studi medioevali 5 (Pistoia: Vita e pensiero, 1982).
- , "La théologie comme science dans la littérature quodlibétique," *RTAM* 11 (1939): 351–374.
- Lector et compiler: Vincent de Beauvais, frère prêcheur un intellectuel et son milieu de au XIII^e siècle*, ed. Serge Lusignan, Monique Palmer-Foucort and Marie-Christine Duchesne. Grâne: CNRS, 1997.
- Lee, Harold, "The anti-Lombard figures of Joachim of Fiore: a reinterpretation [figures of the Trinity]," in *Prophecy and millenarianism*, ed. Ann Williams, 129–142. Essex: Longman, 1980.
- Leff, Gordon. *Medieval thought: St. Augustine to Ockham*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1958.
- , *Paris and Oxford Universities in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries*. New York: Wiley, 1968.
- LeGoff, Jacques, "Implantation des ordres mendiants et fait urban dans la France médiévale," *Annales* 23 (1968), 833; and 25 (1970): 924–946
- , "Ordres mendiants et urbanisation dans la France médiévale," *Annales* 25 (1970): 924–965
- Lesnick, Daniel. *Preaching in medieval Florence: The social world of Franciscan and Dominican spirituality*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia, 1989.
- Libéra, A. de. *Introduction à la mystique rhénane d'Albert le Grand à Maître Eckhart*. Sagesse chrétienne. Paris: O.E.I.L., 1984.
- Little, Andrew G., "Educational organization of the mendicant orders in England," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, n.s. 8 (1894): 49–70
- Long, R. James, "Richard Fishacre's treatise *De Libero Arbitrio*," in *Les philosophies morales et politiques au Moyen Âge*, 2: 879–891.

- Longère, Jean, "Le pouvoir de prêcher et le contenu de la prédication dans l'occident chrétien," in *Predication et propagande au Moyen Age: Islam, Byzance, Occident: Penn-Paris-Dumbarton Oaks Colloquia, III, session des 20-25 octobre 1980*, 165-172. Paris: Presses universitaires, 1983.
- , *La prédication médiévale*. Paris: Etudes augustinienne, 1983.
- Lottin, Odéon, "Saint Thomas d'Aquin à la faculté des arts de Paris aux approches de 1277," *RTAM* 16 (1949): 292-313.
- Lytle, Guy Fitch, "Universities as religious authorities in the later Middle Ages and Reformation," in *Reform and authority in the medieval and Reformation Church*, ed. Guy Fitch Lytle, 69-97. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1981.
- Maiერი, Alfonso. *University training in medieval Europe*, transl. D. N. Pryds. Education and society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 3. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Mandonnet, Pierre, "La canonization of saint Thomas d'Aquin," *Mélanges Thomistes*, Bibliothèque thomiste (Le Saulchoire, Kain) 3 (1923): 2-48.
- , "La crise scolaire au début du XIII^e siècle et le fondation de l'Ordre de Frères Prêcheurs," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 15 (1914): 34-49.
- , "Les premières disputes sur la distinction réelle entre l'essence et l'existence," *Revue thomiste* 18 (1910): 741-765.
- , *Siger de Brabant et l'averroïsme latin au XIII^e siècle, étude critique et documents inédits*. Collectanea friburgensia 8. Fribourg (Suisse): Librairie de l'Université, 1899.
- , *St. Dominic and his work*, translated by M. Larkin. St. Louis: Herder, 1944.
- , "Les titres doctoraux de Saint Thomas Aquinas," *Revue Thomist* 17 (1909): 597-608.
- Mannath, Joseph, "Harvey of Nedellec's proofs for the existence of God: "De Cognitione Primi Principii, qq III-IV" (1)," *Salesianum* 31 (1969): 46-112.
- Manselli, Raoul, "Due biblioteche di <<Studia>> Minoritici: Santa Croce di Firenze e il Santo di Padova," in *Le Scuole degli Ordini Mendicanti*, 353-372.
- Manuels, *Programmes de Cours et Techniques d'Enseignement dans les Universités Médiévales*, ed. Jacqueline Hamesse. Louvain-la-Neuve: Publications de L'Institut d'Etudes Médiévales, 1994.
- Marenbon, John, "Bonaventure, the German Dominicans and the new translations," in *Medieval Philosophy*, ed. John Marenbon. Routledge history of philosophy 3, 225-240. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Marrone, John Thomas. "The ecclesiology of the secular masters, 1250-1320." Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1972.
- Marrone, Stephen, "Speculative theology in the late thirteenth century and the way to beatitude," in *Les philosophies morales et politiques au Moyen Âge*, 2: 1067-1068.
- Martin, Raymond, "'Quelque premiers' maîtres dominicains de Paris et d'Oxford et la soi-distant école dominicaine augustinienne (1229-1279)," *RSPT* 9 (1920): 556-580.
- , "La table des matières de l'ouvrage 'De quatuor materiis' d'Hervé de Nédellec, O.P.," *RSPT* 18 (1929): 291-295.
- Mattingly, B., "Relation," *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 12 (1967): 216-220.
- Maurer, Armand, "The unity of a science: St. Thomas and the nominalists," in *Comm. St.*, 2: 269-292.
- May, W. W., "The confession of Prouss Bonet, heretic and heresiarch," in *Essays in medieval life and thought presented to A.P. Evans*, 3-39. New York: 1955.
- McGinn, Bernard. *The Calabrian abbot: Joachim of Fiore in the history of western thought*. New York: Macmillan, 1985.
- McLaughlin, Mary. *Intellectual freedom and its limitations in the University of Paris in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries*. New York: Arno Press, 1977.
- , "Paris masters of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and ideas of intellectual freedom," *Church history* 24 (1995): 195-211.
- Medieval learning & literature. Essays presented to R. W. Hunt*, ed. J.J.G. Alexander and M.T. Gibben. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
- Meersseman, G.G., "Concordia inter quatuor ordines mendicantes," *AFP* 4 (1934): 75-97.
- , "In libris gentium non studeant. L'étude des classique interdite aux clercs au moyen âge?" *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 11 (1958): 1-13.
- Mélanges offerts à Étienne Gilson de l'Académie Française*. Toronto: PIMS; Paris: Vrin, 1959.
- Mélanges offerts à M.-D. Chenu*. Paris: Vrin, 1967.
- Menzel, Michael, "Predigt und Predigtorganisation im Mittelalter," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 11 (1991): 337-384.
- Méthodes et instruments du travail intellectuel au moyen âge: études sur le vocabulaire*, ed. Olga Weijers. Etudes sur le vocabulaire intellectuel du moyen âge 3. Turnhout: Brepols, 1990.

- Michalski, Konstanty, "Les courants philosophiques à Oxford et à Paris pendant le XIV^e siècle," in his *La philosophie au XIV^e siècle: six études*, ed. Kurt Flasch, *Opuscula philosophica: Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte* 1. Frankfurt: Minerva, 1969.
- , "La révocation par Frère Barthélemy, en 1316, de thèses incriminées," in *Aus der Geisteswelt des Mittelalters: Studien und Texte Martin Grabmann zur Vollendung des Lebensjahres von Freunden und Schülern gewidmet*, éd. Aldbert Lang, Joseph Lechner, Michael Schmaus. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters: Texte und Untersuchungen, Suppl. 3: 1091–1098. Münster: Aschendorff, 1935.
- Miethke, Jürgen, "Das *Votum De Paupertate Christi et Apostolorum* des Durandus von Sancto Porciano im theoretischen Armutsstreit. Eine Dominikanische Position in der Diskussion um die franziskanische Armut (1332/3)," in *Vera Lex Historiae. Studien zur mittelalterlichen Quellen, Festschrift für Dietrich Kurze*, 149–196. Köln, 1993.
- Minnis, A. J., "The author's two bodies? Authority and fallibility in late medieval textual theory," in *Of the making of books: medieval manuscripts, their scribes and readers: essays presented to M.B. Parkes*, ed. P.R. Robinson and Rivkah Zim, 259–260.
- , "Late medieval discussions of "*compilatio*" and the rôle of the *compiler*" in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 101 (1979): 385–421.
- Minnis, A.J. and A. Brian Scott. *Medieval literary theory and criticism c. 1100–1375*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988.
- Montagnes, Bernard, "L'organisation territoriale des frères prêcheurs," in *Dominicains et Dominicaines en Alsace XIII^e–XX^e siècle. Actes du colloque de Guebwiller 8–9 avril 1994*, ed. Jean-Luc Eichenlaub, 21–30. Colmar: Conseil Général, Réussir le Haut-Rhin, Colmar, 1996.
- Mortari, Vincenzo Piano, "L'Argumentum ab auctoritate nel pensiero dei giuristi medievali," *Rivista italiana per le scienze giuridiche* 7 (1954): 458–468.
- Mortier, Daniel. *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs*. 8 vols. Paris: A. Picard, 1903–1920.
- Mouvements franciscains et société française XII^e et XX^e siècles: études présentées à la table ronde CNRS, 23 octobre 1982*, ed. A. Vauchez, Beuchessnes. Religion 14. Paris: Beauchesne, 1984.
- Mulchahey, M.-M., "Dominican education and the Dominican ministry in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: Fra Jacop Passavanti and the Florentine convent of San Maria Novella," Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1989.
- , "The Dominican *studium* system and the universities of Europe in the thirteenth century: a relationship redefined," in *Manuels, Programmes de Cours et Techniques d'Enseignement dans les Universités Médiévales*, edited by Jacqueline Hamesse (Louvain-la Neuve: Publications de L'Institut d'Etudes Médiévales, 1994): 279–324.
- , "First the bow is bent in study..." *Dominican education before 1350*. Studies and texts 132. Toronto: PIMS, 1998.
- , "More notes on the education of the *Fratres communes* in the Dominican Order: Elias de Ferreriis of Salagnac's *Libellus de doctrina fratrum*," in *A distinct voice: medieval studies in honor of Leonard E. Boyle, O.P.*, ed. Jacqueline Brown and William P. Stoneman, 328–372. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997.
- Mulhern, Philip F. *The early Dominican laybrother*, Ph.D. diss., Laval University, Quebec, 1944.
- Müller, Jean-Pierre, "Quästionen der ersten Redaction von I, un II. Sent. des Durandus de Sancto Porciano in einer Hs. Der Biblioteca Antoniana in Padua," *Divus Thomas* 19 (1941): 435–446.
- Murdoch, J.E., "From social to intellectual factors: an aspect of the unitary character of later medieval learning," in *The cultural context of medieval learning*, ed. J.E. Murdoch and E. D. Sylla, 271–348. Boston: Reidel, 1975.
- Murphy, John, "The early Franciscan *studium* at the University of Paris," in *Studium Generale: studies offered to Astrik L. Gabriel*, Texts and studies in the history of medieval education, no. 11. Notre Dame: Medieval Institute, 1967.
- Nadeau, Alain, "Faire œuvre utile. Notes sur le vocabulaire de quelques prologues dominicains du XIII^e siècle," in *Lector et compiler*, 77–96.
- Nardi, Pablo, "Relations with authority," in *Universities in the Middle Ages*, 77–107.
- Nascita dell'Europa et Europa Carolingia: Un'equazione da verificare*. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto medioevo 27. Spoleto: Presso la sede del Centro, 1981.
- Nealy, F. D., "The administration of Dominican education in the first two centuries of its foundation, 1221–1451." Ph.D. diss., Aquinas Institute of Philosophy, River Forest, IL, 1957.
- O'Carroll, Maura, "The educational organization of the Dominicans in England and Wales, 1221–1345: a multi disciplinary approach," *AFP* 40 (1990): 23–62.

- O'Donnell, James J., "Authority of Augustine", *Augustinian studies* 22 (1991): 7–35.
- Olsen, B. Munck, "Les florissantes d'auteurs classiques," in *Les genres littéraires*, 151–164.
- O'Malley, John, "Introduction: medieval preaching," in *De ore Domini: Preacher and word in the Middle Ages*, Studies in medieval culture 27, 1–11. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Press, 1989.
- De ore Domini: preacher and word in the Middle Ages*. Studies in medieval culture 27. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Press, 1989.
- Orlandi, S., "Fra Remigio de' Girolami e Dante," *Memoire Domenicane* 84 (1967): 8–43; 90–127.
- Ott, Ludwig, "Die Auseinandersetzung des Durandus de S. Porciano mit Thomas vom Aquin in der Lehre vom Weihesakrament," in *Thomas vom Aquino. Interpretation und Rezeption: Studien und Texte*, ed. W. Eckert. Walbergen Studien, Philosophische Reihe Bd. 5, 519–558. Mainz: Matthias Grundwald Verlag, 1974.
- , *Die Lehre des Durandus de S. Porciano O.P. vom Weihesakrament: dargestellt nach den verschiedenen Redaktionen seines Sentenzenkommentars und nach der Diskussion der Dominikanertheologie des beginnenden 14. Jahrhunderts*, Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Institutes zur Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Theologie und Philosophie, Neu Folge 17. München: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1972.
- Owens, Joseph. *An elementary Christian metaphysics*. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1963.
- Panella, E., "Per lo studio di fra Remigio dei Girolami (+1319). *Contra falsos professores ecclesiae*," *Memorie Domenicane*, n.s. 10 (1979): 11–313.
- , "Un'introduzione alla filosofia in uno 'studium' dei fratri Predicate ri," *ibid.* 1.2 (1981): 27–125.
- Paolo, C. *La prima critica di Ervaeo di Nedellec alla antropologia di Enrico de Gand*. Rome: Salesiana, 1974.
- Paré, G., A. Brunet, and P. Tremblay. *La Renaissance du XII^e siècle: les ecoles et l'en-seignement*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1933.
- Parkes, M.B., "The influence of the concepts of "ordinatio" and "compilatio" on the development of the book," in *Medieval learning & literature. Essays presented to R.W. Hunt*, ed. J.J.G. Alexander and M.T. Gibben, 115–141. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
- Pasnau, Robert. *Theories of cognition in the later middle ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Paul, Jacques, "La signification social du Franciscanisme," in *Mouvements franciscains et société française XII^e et XX^e siècles: études présentées à la table rond CNRS, 23 octobre 1982*, ed. A. Vauchez, Beauchesnes Religions, 14, 9–25. Paris: Beauchesne, 1984.
- Paulus, Jean. *Henri de Gand: essai sur les tendances de sa métaphysique*, Études de philosophie médiévale 25. Paris: Vrin, 1938.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The growth of medieval theology (600–1300)*. The Christian tradition: a history of the development of doctrine 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Pelster, F., "Die Bibliothek von Santa Caterina zu Pisa, eine Büchersammlung aus den Zeiten des hl. Thomas von Aquin," *Xenia Thomistica* 3 (1925): 249–280.
- , "Thomas von Sutton O. Pr., ein Oxfordter Verteidiger der thomistischen Lehre," *ZKT* 46 (1922): 212–253; 361–401.
- Pelzer, Auguste. *Codices Vaticani latini, codices 679–1134*, tom. 2, pt. 1. Biblioteca Vaticana: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1931.
- , "Prétendus auteurs des répliques au correctoire de Guillaume de la Mare," *AFP* 13 (1943): 95–100.
- Perler, D. "Peter Aureol vs. Hervaeus Natalis on intentionality. A text edition with introductory remarks," *AHDLM* 61 (1994): 227–262.
- Philippe, M-Dom., "Les processions divines selon Durand de Saint-Pourçain," *RT* 47 (1947): 244–288.
- Les philosophes morales et politiques au Moyen Age: actes du 9e Congrès international de philosophie médiévale, Ottawa, 17–27 août 1992*, éd. B. Carlos Bazán, Eduardo Andújar and Léonard G. Sbrocchi. 3 vols. Société Internationale pour l'Étude de la philosophie Médiévale. New York: Legas, 1992.
- Planzer, Dominikus, "Die Tabula Privilegiorum O. P.," *AFP* 10(1940): 222–257.
- Plotnik, Kenneth, *Hervaeus Natalis OP and the controversies over the real presence and transubstantiation*, Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Institutes zur Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Theologie und Philosophie, Neu Folge 10. München: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1970.
- Polica, Gabriella Severino, "Libro, Lettura, <<Lezione>> negli Studia degli Ordini Mendicanti (Sec. XIII)," in *Le scuole degli ordini mendicanti*, 373–414. Todì: Presso L'Accademia Tudertina, 1978.
- Polzer, Joseph, "The triumph of Thomas" panel in Santa Caterina, Pisa. Meaning & date," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 37 (1993): 29–70.
- Principe, Walter, "Thomas Aquinas' principles for interpretation of patristic texts," *Studies in medieval*

- culture 8 & 9, ed. John R. Sommerfeldt and E. Rozanne Elder, 111–121. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, The Medieval Institute, 1976.
- Preuve et raisons à l'université de Paris: logique, ontologie et théologie au XIV^e siècle*. Actes de la Table Ronde internationale organisée par le Laboratoire associé au C.N.R.S. n° 152 du 5 au 7 novembre 1981, ed. Zénon Kaluza et Paul Vignaux. Paris: Vrin, 1984.
- Les questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les facultés de théologie, de droit et de médecine*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1985.
- Rashdall, Hastings, "The Friars Preachers and the Universities," in *Collectanea*, ed. M. Burrows, 2nd ser. pt. 3, 195–273. Oxford: Oxford Historical Society, 1890.
- . *The universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1895.
- Rebirth, reform and resilience*, ed. James Kittleson. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984.
- The reception of the church fathers in the West from the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. Irene Backus. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Redigonda, L.A., "Fratri della Predicatori," *Dizionario degli Istituti di Perfezione*, 4, 924.
- Renard, Jean-Pierre "La formation et la designation des Predicateurs au debut de l'Ordre des precheurs (1215–1237)." Ph.D. diss., University of Fribourg (Freiburg: Imprimerie St. Canisius), 1977.
- Riché, Pierre, "'Auctoritas', 'ratio', et 'divina pagina' dans la culture théologique à l'époque carolingienne," in *Nascita dell'Europa et Europa Carolingia: Un'equazione da verificare*. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto medioevo 27, 2, 719–758. Spoleto: Presso la sede del Centro, 1981.
- Riquet, M., "St. Thomas et les auctoritates en philosophie," *Archives de philosophie* 3(1925): 117–155.
- Robb, Fiona, "The Fourth Lateran Councils definition of Trinitarian orthodoxy," *Journal of ecclesiastical history* 48 (1997): 22–43.
- Robles, L., "El estudio de las artes liberales en la primitiva legislación dominicana. Antecedentes históricos," *Artes libéraux et philosophie au moyen âge*, Actes du quatrième Congrès international de philosophie médiévale, 599–616. Montreal: University of Montreal, 1969.
- Roensch, Frederick J. *Early Thomistic school* Dubuque, Iowa: The Priory Press, 1964.
- Rouse, M.A. and R. H. *Authentic witnesses: approaches to medieval texts and manuscripts, publications in medieval studies*. Notre Dame Conferences in Medieval Studies 17. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991.
- , "Floregia of patristic texts," in *Les genres littéraires*, 165–180.
- , "Ordinatio and compilatio revisited," in *Ad litteram: authoritative texts and their medieval readers*, ed. Mark Jordan and Kent Emery. Notre Dame Conferences in Medieval Studies 3, 113–134. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992.
- , "The verbal concordance to the Scriptures," *AFP* 44 (1974): 5–30.
- Roy, Philippe. *Les Cathares: histoire et spiritualité*. Paris: Dervy, 1993.
- Saenger, Paul Henry. *Space between words: the origins of silent reading*. Figueras. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1977.
- Santeler, Joseph. *Der kausale Gottesbeweis bei Herveus Natalis: nach dem ungedruckten Traktat de cognitione primi principii*, Philosophie und Grenzwissenschaften: Schriftenreihe 3. Innsbruck: Felizian Rauch, 1930.
- Sapientiae procerum amore: Mélanges Médiévistes offerts à Dom Jean-Pierre Müller O.S.B. à l'occasion de son 70ème anniversaire (24 février 1974)*, ed. Theodor W. Köhler. Studia Anselmiana 63. Rome: Editrice Anselmiana, 1974.
- Schmaus, Michael. *Der liber propugnatorius des Thomas Anglicus und die Lebrunterschiede zwischen Thomas von Aquin und Duns Scotus*, BGPMA 29. Münster: Aschendorff, 1930.
- Schmitt, Jean-Claude, "Où en est l'enquête Ordres mendiants et urbanisation dans la France médiévale," in *Stellung und Wirksamkeit der Bettelorden in der städtischen Gesellschaft*, ed. Kaspar Elm, 13–18. Berlin: Duncker & Humbolt, 1981.
- Schöllgen, Werner. *Das problem der Willensfreiheit bei Heinrich von Gent und Hervaeus Natalis: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kampfes zwischen Augustinismus und Aristotelismus in der Hochscholastik*, Abhandlungen aus Ethik und Moral 6. Düsseldorf: Druck und Verlag von L. Schwann, 1927.
- Schmitt, Jean-Claude, "Où en est l'enquête Ordres mendiants et urbanisation dans la France médiévale," in *Stellung und Wirksamkeit der Bettelorden in der städtischen Gesllschaft*, ed. Kasper Elm, 13–18. Berlin: Duncker & Humbolt, 1981.
- Schöllgen, Werner. *Das problem der Willensfreiheit bei Heinrich von Gent und Hervaeus Natalis: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kampfes zwischen Augustinismus und Aristotelismus in der Hochscholastik*, Abhandlungen aus Ethik und Moral 6. Düsseldorf: Druck und Verlag von L. Schwann,

- Schönberger, Rolf. *Relation als Vergleich: Die Relationstheorie des Johannes Buridan im Kontext seines Denkens und der Scholastik*, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 43. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Schönborn, Christoph, "Die Autorität des Lehrers nach Thomas von Aquin," in *Christian authority: essays in honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. G.R. Evans, 101–126. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Schwinges, Rainer Christoph, "Student education, student life," in *Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. Hilde de Ridder Symoens, A History of the University in Europe 1, ed. Walter Rugg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Le scuole degli ordini mendicanti (secoli XIII-XIV)*. Convegni del Centro di Studi sulla spiritualità médiévale 17. Todi: Presso L'Accademia Tudertina, 1978.
- Sebastian, Wenceslaus, "The controversy after Scotus to 1900," in *The dogma of the Immaculate Conception: history and significance*, ed. Edward O'Connor, 213–270. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958.
- Senko, W., "Les opinions d'Hervé Nédellec au sujet de l'essence et de l'existence," *MMP* 10 (19610): 59–84.
- Senner, Walter, "Jean de Sterngassen et son commentaire des Sentences," *RT* 97 (1997): 83–98.
- Serene, Eileen, "Demonstrative science," *CHLMP*, 496–518.
- Sheehan, Michael, "The Religious Orders, 1220–1370," in *The Early Oxford Schools*, ed. by J. Catto (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 193–223.
- Showalter, D. E., "The business of salvation: authority and representation in the thirteenth-century Dominican Order," *Catholic Historical Review* (1972): 556–574.
- Siemiakowska, Z. K., "Deux découvertes au sujet de Jacques de Metz et de Jean Picardi," *MRP* (1961): 29–32.
- Smalley, Beryl, "Ecclesiastical attitudes to novelty, c. 1100–c. 1250," in *Church, society and politics*, ed. Derek Baker. Studies in Church History 12, 113–132. Oxford: Blackwell, 1975.
- . "Robert Bacon and the early Dominican school at Oxford," *TRHS*, 4th ser., 30 (1948): 1–19.
- . *The study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964.
- Spiazzi, Raymond. *Alla Scuola di San Domenico*. 5 vols. Rome: San Sisto Vecchio, 1967–1985.
- Spicq, P.C. *Eskisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge*, Bibliothèque thomiste 26. Paris: J. Vrin, 1944.
- Spier, Kerry, "Four manuscripts on evangelical poverty," *Collectanea Franciscana* 59 (1989): 323–349.
- Spruitt, Leen. *Species intelligibilis: from perception to knowledge*. Brill's studies in intellectual history 49. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Stegmüller, Friedrich. *Repertorium Commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi* 1. Herbipoli: Apud Ferdinandum Schöningh, 1947.
- Stella, Prospero T., "Le <<Quaestiones de Libero Arbitrio>>" di Durando da S. Porciano," *Salesianum* 3 (1962): 450–524.
- , "La prima critica di Hervaeus Natalis O.P. alla noetica di Enrico di Gand: il 'De intellectu et specie' del cosiddetto 'De Quattuor Materialibus'" *Salesianum* 21 (1959): 1–70.
- , "A proposito di Pietro Palude (in I Sent., d. 43, q. 1): la question inedita 'Utrum Deum esse infinitum in perfectione et vigore possit efficaci ratione robari' di Erveo Natalis," *Salesianum* 22 (1960): 245–325.
- Stellung Wirksamkeit der Bettelorden in der städtischen Gesellschaft*, ed. Kaspar Elm. Berliner historische studien. 3: Ordensstudium. Berlin: Duncker & Humboldt, 1981.
- Studium Generale: studies offered to Astrik L. Gabriel*. Texts and studies in the history of medieval education 11. Notre Dame: Medieval Institute, 1967.
- Stufler, Johann von, "Bemerkungen zur konkurslehre des Durandus von St. Pourçain," *BGPMA*, Suppl. 3, 2 (1925): 1080–1090.
- Sturlese, Loris, "Alle origini della mistica speculative tedesca. Antichi testi su Teodorico di Freiburg," *Medioevo* 3 (1977): 21–87.
- Swanson, Scott, "Emerging concepts of jurisdiction, sacramental orders, and property right among Dominican thinkers from Thomas Aquinas to Hervaeus Natalis (1250–1320)." Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1988.
- Swiezawski, Stefan, "Quelques déformations de la pensée de St. Thomas dans la tradition thomiste," in *Aquinas and the problems of his time*, ed. G. Verbeke and D. Verhelst. Mediaevalia Lovaniensia 1, 38–54. Louvain: Nihjoff, 1976.
- Sylla, E.D., "The Oxford Calculators," in the *Cambridge history of later medieval philosophy*, ed. N. Kretzmann, A. Kenny, and J. Pinborg, 540–563. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Synan, Edward, "Aquinas and his age," *Calgary Aquinas studies*, ed. Anthony Parel. Aquinas

- Septicentennial Conference 1974, University of Calgary, 49–64. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1978.
- , “Brother Thomas, the Master & Masters,” *Comm. St.*, 2: 219–244.
- Synan, Edward A., “Sensibility and science in medieval theology: the witness of Durandus of St. Pourçain and Denis the Carthusian,” in *Knowledge and the sciences in medieval philosophy: proceedings of the 8th International Congress of Medieval Philosophy (S.I.P.E.M.), Helsinki 24–29 August 1987*, Acta philosophica Fennica, 1990, 531–539.
- Tachau, Katherine, “Looking gravely at Dominican puns: the sermons of Robert Holcot and Ralph Friseby,” *Traditio* 46 (1991): 337–345.
- , *Vision and certitude in the age of Ockham: optics, epistemology and the foundations of semantics, 1250–1345*, Studien und Text zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 22. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- Tavuzzi, Michael, “Hervaeus Natalis and the philosophical logic of the Thomism of the Renaissance,” *Doctor Communis* 45 (1992): 151–152.
- , *Prierias: the life and works of Silvestro Mazzolini da Prierio, 1456–1527*, Duke monographs in Medieval and Renaissance studies 16. Durham: Duke University Press, 1997.
- Théry, G., “Caractères généraux de la spiritualité dominicaine,” *La Vie spirituelle* 54, Suppl. 23–24 (1938): 22–39.
- Thijssen, J.M.M.H., *Censure and heresy at the University of Paris, 1200–1400*, The Middle Ages series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998.
- Thomas, Antoninus H., “La profession religieuse des Dominicains. Formule, cérémonies, histoire,” *AFP* 39 (1969): 5–52.
- , “Une version des statuts de Prémontré au début du XIII^e siècle,” *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 55 (1979): 153–170.
- Thomas Aquinas and his legacy*, ed. David M. Gallagher. Studies in philosophy and the history of philosophy 39. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1994.
- Thomas von Aquino. Interpretation und Rezeption: Studien und Texte*, ed. W. Eckert. Walbergen Studien, Philosophische Reihe Bd. 5. Mainz: Matthias Grunewald Verlag, 1974.
- Tierney, Brian, “‘Only the truth has authority’: the problem of ‘reception’ in the Decretalists and in John deTorrecremata,” in *Law, Church, and society: essays in honor of Stephan Kuttner*, ed. Kenneth Pennington and Robert Somerville, 69–96. Pittsburgh: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.
- Torrell, Jean-Pierre, *Initiation à Saint Thomas d’Aquin: sa personne et son oeuvre*. Vestigia 13. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse, 1993.
- , *Saint Thomas Aquinas: the person and his work*, trans. Robert Royal. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1996.
- , “Le savoir théologique chez les premiers thomistes,” *RT* 97 (1997): 9–30.
- Trapp, Damasus, “Augustinian theology of the fourteenth century: notes on editions, marginalia, opinions and booklore,” *Augustiniana* 6 (1956): 146–274.
- Trabold, C., “Esse und essentia nach Johannes Quidort von Paris im Vergleich mit Thomas von Aquin.” Ph.D. diss., Rome, Pont. Athen. Anselmianum, 1958.
- Trotman, Christine, “Vision béatifique et intuition d’un objet absent: des sources franciscaines du nominalisme aux défenseurs scotistes de l’opinion de Jean XXII sur la vision différée,” *Studi mediavali* 34 (1994): 653–715.
- Tugwell, Simon, “Friars and canons: the earliest canons,” in *Monastic studies*, ed. Judith Loades, 2, 193–207. Bangor: Headstart, 1992.
- , “De Huiusmodi Sermonibus Tesitur Omnis recta Predicatio: changing attitudes towards the Word of God,” in *De l’Homélie au sermon. Histoire de la prédication médiévale*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1993.
- , “Humbert of Romans, ‘Compiler,’” in *Lector et compiler: Vincent de Beauvais, frère prêcheur un intellectuel et son milieu au XIII^e siècle*, sous la direction de Serge Lusignan and Monique Paulmer-Foucart avec la collaboration de Marie-Christine Duchenne, Rencontres à Royamont. Grâne, France: Editiones Créaphis, c. 1997.
- van Engen, John, “The Christian Middle Ages as an Historiographical Problem,” *American Historical Review* 91 (1986), 519–552.
- Ullrich, Lothar, *Fragen der Schöpfungslehre nach Jakob von Metz O.P. Eine Vergleichende untersuchung zu Sentenzenkommentaren aus der Dominikanerschule um 1300*, Erfurter Theologische Studien 20. Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1966.
- Università e società nei secoli XII–XVI, atti del non convegno internazionale di studio tenuto a Pistoia nei giorni 20–25 settembre 1979*. Pistoia: 1982.
- Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. Hilde de Ridder Symoens. A History of the university in Europe 1, ed.

- Walter Riegg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Vaucher, Andre, "Les canonisations de S. Thomas et de S. Bonaventure: pourquoi deux siècles decart," in 1274 [Douze cent soixante-quarante], année charnier, mutations et continuités: Lyon-Paris, 20-septembre -5 octobre 1974, Colloques internationaux du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, no. 558, 753-767. Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1997.
- , "Culture et sainteté d'après les procès de canonisation des XIII^e et XIV^e siècles," in *Le scuole degli ordini mendicanti (secoli XIII-XIV) 11-14 ottobre 1976*, Covegni del Centro di Studi sulla spiritualità médiévale 17, 162-164. Tod: Presso L'Accademia Tudertina, 1978.
- Vanderjagt, A. J. *Laurens Pignon, OP: Confessor of Philip the Good. Ideas on jurisdiction and the estates*. Venlo: Miélot, 1985.
- Verger, Jacques, "L'histoire des institutions scolaires et les études de philosophie médiévale," in *Gli studi di filosofia médiévale fra Otto e Novecento*. Contributo a un bilancio storiografico, ed. R. Imach and A. Maierú. Storia e letteratura 179: 361-375. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1991.
- , "Patterns," in *Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. Hilde Ridder-Symoens. A history of the university in Europe, ed. Walter Riegg. 1: 35-76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- , "Studia et universités," in *Le scuole degli ordini mendicanti*, 173-204
- , "Teachers," in *Universities in the Middle Ages*, 161-168.
- Verheijen, Luc. *La règle de saint Augustin*. Paris, 1967.
- Vicaire, Marie-Humbert, "L'action de l'enseignement et de prédication des Mendicants vis-à-vis des cathares," *Cahiers de Fanjeux* 20 (1985): 277-304.
- , "La Bulle de confirmation des Prêcheurs," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 47 (1952): 176-192.
- , "Le développement de la province dominicaine de Provence (1215-1295)," *Cahiers de Fanjeux* 8 (1973): 35-77.
- , "Innocent III a-t-il néconnu Dominique?" *Mémoire Dominicaine* 1 (1992): 129-143.
- , "Innocent III, Diego, and Dominic in 1206," in *St. Dominic and his work* (St. Louis: Herder, 1944), 405-421.
- , "L'Ordre de S. Dominique en 1215," *AFP* (1984): 5-38.
- , "Les origines dominicaines de la mendicité religieuse," *Vie dominicaine* 35 (1975): 195-206; 259-279
- , "Predicantibus-Predicatoribus: La bull du 21 Janvier 1217 (H317)," *Cahiers de Fanjeux* 1, 44-46
- , "La Règle de S. Augustin à la fondation de l'Ordre des Prêcheurs," *La Vie Spirituelle* 145 (1991): 261-279
- , "Sacerdoce et prédication aux origines de l'ordre des prêcheurs," *RSPT* 64 (1980): 241-254.
- , *Saint Dominic and his times*, transl. Katherine Pond. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- , "Lo spirito di S. Domenico e la sua intenzione nella fondazione dei Fratri Predicatori," *Bollettino di S. Domenico* 65 (1984): 47-51; 91-94; 161-163; 188-196.
- , "St. Dominic and the Pope in 1215," in *St. Dominic and his work* (St. Louis: Herder, 1944): 422-446.
- Viola, Coloman, "L'école thomiste au Moyen Âge," in *La philosophie contemporaine Chroniques nouvelles* 6. Philosophie et science au Moyen Âge, 345-377. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1990.
- Vollert, Cyril. *The doctrine of Hervaeus Natalis on primitive justice and original sin as developed in the controversy on original sin during the early decades of the fourteenth century*. Analecta Gregoriana 42. Rome: Universitas Gregoriana, 1947.
- Vooght, Paul de. *Les sources de la doctrine Chrétienne: d'après les théologiens du XIV^e du début du XVe avec le texte intégral des XII premières questions de la Summa inédit de Gérard de Bologne (†1317)*. Paris: Brouwer, 1953.
- Wallace, William, "Aristotle in the Middle Ages," *DMA* 1, 456-469.
- Walsh, Katherine, "The later medieval schoolman in theory and practice," *Innsbrucker historischen Studien* 2 (1979): 171-176.
- Walz, A. "Ordinationes capitulorum generalium de Sancto Thoma eiusque cultu et doctrina," *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum* 16 (1923-24): 168-173.
- , "Papst Johannes XXII. und Thomas von Aquin. Zur geschichte der Heiligsprechung des Aquinaten," *Comm. St.* 1: 29-50.
- Wei, Ian P., "The masters of theology at the University of Paris in the late thirteenth century: an authority beyond the schools," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 75 (1993): 37-63.
- , "The self-image of the masters of theology at the University of Paris in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46 (1995): 398-431.
- Weijers, Olga. *Terminologie des universités au XIII^e siècle*, Lessico Intellettuale Europeo, 29. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1987.

- Weinberg, Julius. *Abstraction, relation and induction: three essays in the history of thought* Madison & Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965.
- , "The concept of relation: some observations on its history," in his *Abstraction, relation*, 61–119.
- Weisheipl, James, "Evolution of the scholastic method," in *The logic of science*, Philosophical series 4, ed. Vincent E. Smith (New York: St. John's University Press, 1964).
- . *Friar Thomas d'Aquino*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1974.
- Wengert, Ruth G., "Three senses of intuitive cognition: a quodlibetal question of Harvey of Nedellec," *Franciscan Studies* 43 (1983): 408–431.
- White, Alan, "The foundation of the Order of Preachers and its historical setting," in *The way of the preacher*, ed. Simon Tugwell, 97–110. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1979.
- White, Kevin, "Saint Thomas et Durand de Saint Pourçain: la question de la certitude de la foi," in *Jean Capreolus en son temps (1380–1444)*, ed. Guy Beduolle, Romanus Cessario & Kevin White, Mémoire Dominicaine, numéro spécial 1, 165–176. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1997.
- Wielockx, R., "Autor du Proce de Thomas d'Aquin," in *Thomas von Aquin*, ed. A. Zimmermann, 413–438. Berlin: 1988.
- Wiishire, Leland, "The Oxford Condemnations of 1277 and the intellectual life of the thirteenth century universities," in *Aspectus et affectus: essays and editions in Grosseteste and medieval intellectual life in honor of Richard C. Dales*, ed. Gunar Freibergs, AMS studies in the Middle Ages 23, 113–124. New York: AMS Press, 1993.
- Wippel, John, "The condemnations of 1270 and 1277 at Paris," *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 7(1977): 169–201.
- . *Mediaeval reactions to the encounter between faith and reason*, the Aquinas lecture, 1995. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1995.
- , "Quodlibetal question as a distinctive literary genres," in *Les genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales: Définition, critique, et exploitation*, Actes du Colloque international de Louvain-la-Neuve, 25–27 Mai, 1981, 67–84. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982.
- , "Quodlibetal questions, chiefly in theology faculties," in *Les questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les facultés de théologie, de droit et de médecine*, 153–224. Turnhout: Brepols, 1985.
- , "The relationship between essence and existence in late thirteenth century thought: Giles of Rome, Henry of Ghent, Godfrey of Fontaines and James of Viturbo," in *Ancient and medieval philosophies of existence*, ed. P. Morewedge, New York: 1981.
- Xenia medii aevi historiam illustrantia oblata Thomae Kaeppli O.P.* 2 vols. Storia e letteratura, 141–142. Roma: Edizioni di storia et letteratura, 1978.
- Xenia Thomistica*, ed. Sadac Szabó. 3 vols. Romae: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1925.
- Ypma, E. *La formation des professeurs chez Ermites de Saint-Augustin de 1256 à 1354*. Paris: Centre d'Études Augustins, 1956.
- Zuckerman, Charles Abraham. "Dominican theories of papal primacy, 1250–1320," Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1971.
- , Charles Abraham, "Some texts of Bernard of Auvergne on papal power," *RTAM* 49 (1982): 174–204.

Index

- Aegidism 37, 52
- agent intellect 97, 98
- Alan of Lille 114
- Albert of Brescia 61
- Albert the Great 30, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 61, 62, 64, 77, 83, 109, 116, 124, 133, 137
- Albigensian Crusade 13
- Albigensianism 12
- Albigensians 14
- Aldobrandino de Tuscanella 129
- Alexander IV 31
- Alexander of Hales 109, 113
- Alexander Stavenby 22
- Anselm of Canterbury 113, 119
- Aristotelian dialectic 37–38
- Aristotelianism 4, 9, 29, 35, 36, 37, 43, 47
- Aristotelians 50
- Aristotle 36, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 74, 110, 112, 120, 122
 - auctoritas* of 112, 120
 - Categories* 88
 - citations of 91
 - Ethics* 25, 48
 - influence of 9
 - Metaphysics* 25, 44, 88
 - Posterior Analytics* 25
 - Prior Analytics* 25
 - texts 35
- Armand of Bellevue 62
- Arnold of Prato 19
- Athanasius 119
- auctoritas*
 - criteria for 109–110
 - definition 108–109
- auctoritates* 110–111, 114
- Augustine of Hippo 51, 109, 111, 119, 120
 - auctoritas* of 4, 112, 132
 - citations of 91
- Augustinian Rule 15
- Augustinianism 6, 37, 53
- Augustinians (OAE) 21, 115, 116, 118, 132
- Augustinians (scholastics in Augustinian tradition) 35, 50, 51, 53, 57, 100, 114, 132
- Averroes 109
- Averroists 35, 50, 129
- Avicbron 109
- Aylmeric de Pianza 42, 76

Bacon, Robert [47](#), [120](#)
 Bacon, Roger [109](#), [112](#)
 Barthélemy of Breganza [40](#)
 Bartolomeo da San Concordio [131](#)
 Benedict XII [115](#)
 Berengarius of Landorra [65](#), [78](#)
 Bernard Gui [68](#)
 Bernard of Auvergne [62](#)
 Bernard of Clairveaux [118](#), [120](#)
 Bernard of Lombardy [114](#)
 Bernard of Trilia [61](#), [62](#), [63](#)
 Berthold de Moosburg [65](#)
 Black Death of 1348 [131](#)
 Blackfriars, *see* [Oxford friars](#)
 Boethius [110](#), [119](#), [120](#)
 Bombologno of Bologna [61](#)
 Bonaventure [51](#), [62](#), [109](#), [113](#)
 Bonhomme of Brittany [45](#)
 Boniface VIII [68](#), [71](#)
Super Cathedram [54](#)
 Boyle, Leonard [137](#)

Cajetan [132](#)
 Carmelites [21](#), [51](#), [115](#), [118](#), [132](#)
 Cathars, *see* [Albigensians](#)
 Catharism, *see* [Albigensianism](#)
 Capreolus [81](#), [132](#)
 Church, authority of [104](#)
 Church Fathers, *see* [patristic authorities](#)
 Cicero [110](#), [112](#)
 Cistercians [13](#), [21](#), [51](#), [126](#)
 Clement IV [118](#)
 Clement V [63](#), [71](#)
 cognition [96](#), [99](#)
collationes [24](#), [100](#)

- commissions charged with investigating Durandus' writings [8](#), [95](#), [119](#), [134](#) (1313) [77](#), [78](#), [82](#), [118](#), [122](#) (1317) [80–81](#),
- list of errors (1313) [78](#), [80](#), [130](#)
- syllabi of errors [115](#), [125](#)

Condemnations of 1277 [3–4](#), [36](#), [50](#), [51–52](#), [64](#), [96](#), [115](#), [127](#)

- Dominican reactions to [53](#)
- revocation [128](#)

Congar, Yves [48](#)
Constitutions of Premontre [15](#)

Correctoria controversies [60](#), [76](#), [87](#), [100](#), [105](#)
 Council of Vienne [131](#)
Cum qui recipit prophetam [14](#)
cura animarum [15](#), [63](#), [129](#), [130](#), [137](#), [139](#)
cursor biblicus [26](#)
cursor Sententiarum [26](#), [27](#)

Dampnamus [96](#), [117](#)
 Dante [61](#), [113](#)
Decretals [94](#)
 Delaruelle, Etienne [6](#)
 Diego of Osma [13](#)
 Dietrich of Freiburg [62](#), [64–65](#), [82](#), [87](#), [96](#), [128](#)

- De ente et essentia* [65](#)
- Opera omnia* [64](#)

Dionysius de Burgo 132
 disputations 24, 100
 Dominic Guzman 13, 14, 15, 16, 21
 canonization 22
 Dominican Order 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 35, 41
 adoption and dissemination of Aquinas' teachings 4, 101, 121, 122, 128, 130, 136, 139, 140
 and Aquinas' cult and canonization 128, 129, 131, 133, 135
 and Aristotelianism 48
 and Augustinian tradition 137
 [auctoritates](#) of 115
 Constitutions 7, 15, 17, 20, 22, 23, 44
 Constitutiones antiquae 44
 Consuetudines 15
 early growth 20–22
 foundation 11, 14
 governmental structure 11, 17, 57, 135
 hierarchy 124
 Institutions 15
 papal approbation 13
 priory schools 23–24, 29
 provincial schools 23,
 recruitment practices 21
 relationship with Franciscans 21, 131
 relationship with papacy 70, 127, 136
 relationship with universities 12
 'school' 35
 school system 23, 137
 schools 140 *see* [studia](#) ...
 schools, reform of 45
 schools in logic 44–45
 theologians 114, 137
 Donatus 110
 Duns Scotus 63, 70, 73, 105
 Durandus of St. Pourçain 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 27, 53, 55, 62, 68, 70, 74, 85, 86, 87, 92, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 124, 126, 128, 130, 134, 137, 138
 and *auctoritas* of Scripture 117
 and *auctoritas* of Thomas 122, 123–124
 [auctoritas](#) of 124–125
 [auctoritates](#) cited by 119–120
 cognition, theory of 97, 98–99, 139
 Commentary on the Sentences 8, 9, 71, 73, 75, 78, 81, 90, 92, 97, 100, 102, 115, 118, 130
 followers of 118–119
 life 71,
 Excusationes 8, 79, 80
 Holy Spirit, spiration of 91–92, 95
 investigation of teachings, *see* [commissions](#)
 De origine jurisdictionum sive de jurisdictione ecclesiastica et de legibus 71
 Quodlibet Avignonense 792, 117
 Quodlibet Parisiensis 177, 122
 Quodlibet Parisiensis II 77
 relations 89–90
 theology, concept of 100–101
 Tractatus de Habitus 77
 Trinitarian theology 139
 Trinitarian theology 139
 Quaestiones de libero arbitrio 77
 Master of the Sacred Palace 71
 Durandellus, Evidentiae contra Durandum 81, 105

Edward I [63](#)

Étienne Bourret [128](#)

Étienne Tempier [3](#), [50](#)

Etsi animarum [31](#), [32](#)

Fathers of the Church, *see* [patristic authorities](#)

Florence of Hesden [45](#)

Fourth Lateran Council (1215) [13](#), [15](#), [93](#), [94](#), [117](#)

Franciscans [4](#), [14](#), [15](#), [21](#), [32](#), [40](#), [47](#), [51](#), [54](#), [92](#), [115](#), [118](#), [136](#)

attitudes towards Thomas [50](#), [127](#)

early growth [20](#)

relationship with Dominicans, *see* [Dominicans – relationship with Franciscans](#)

Franciscan Spirituals [3](#), [55](#), [93](#), [118](#), [128](#), [129](#), [133](#)

see also [Spirituals](#)

free will [5](#)

Frederick II [49](#)

Fries, A. [70](#)

French province [62](#)

Fulk of Toulouse [13](#)

Galieno of Orte [63](#)

Gavagno de la Flamma [68](#)

general chapters

(1220) [15](#), [17](#)

(1221) [17](#)

(1228) [20](#)

(1233) [42](#)

(1236) [18](#), [42](#)

(1249) [15](#)

(1254) [15](#), [32](#)

(1255) [18](#)

(1256) [32](#),

(1259) [25](#), [45](#)

(1261) [46](#)

(1265) [45](#)

(1278) [53](#)

(1280) [54](#)

(1286) [54](#), [123](#)

(1296) [55](#)

(1298) [54](#)

(1303) [55](#)

(1308) [61](#)

(1309) [76](#)

(1313) [24](#), [77](#), [130](#)

(1314) [78](#), [80](#)

(1315) [80](#)

(1316) [80](#)

(1317) [81](#)

(1344) [81](#)

Gerard of Bologna [76](#), [79](#)

Gerard of Frachet [43](#)

Gerard of San Borgo Donnino [32](#)

Introductorius in Evangelium aeternum [31](#),

Gerard of Sterngassen [62](#)

German provinces [62](#)

Gerson, Jean [82](#)

Gilbert of Poitiers [40](#), [121](#)

Giles of Lessines [62](#)

De unitate formae [60](#)

Giles of Rome [50](#), [52](#), [61](#), [62](#), [73](#), [116](#), [132](#)

Gilson, Etienne [6](#)

Glorieux, Palémon [77](#)

Godfrey of Fontaines [50](#), [70](#), [73](#), [100](#)

Grabmann, Martin [70](#)

grammar [36](#)

Gratian [44](#), [110](#)

Gratiarum omnium [14](#)

Gregorian Reform [12](#)

Gregory IV [21](#)

Grundmann, Herbert [6](#)

Guido Terreni [76](#), [79](#), [132](#)

Hauréau, B. [70](#)

Henry of Ghent [50](#), [61](#), [64](#), [66](#), [70](#), [73](#), [87](#), [89](#), [96](#), [100](#), [105](#), [120](#)

Henry of Harclay [61](#)

Henry of Lübeck [62](#)

Henry of Suso [131](#)

Henry Totting of Oyta [62](#)

Hervaeus Natalis [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [53](#), [55](#), [62](#), [63](#), [71](#), [73](#), [77](#), [85](#), [86](#), [87](#), [88](#), [89](#), [90](#), [98](#), [99](#), [100](#), [100](#), [101](#), [102](#), [103](#), [104](#), [105](#), [114](#), [115](#), [116](#), [117](#), [118](#), [119](#), [120](#), [121](#), [122](#), [123](#), [126](#), [128](#), [130](#), [131](#), [134](#), [137](#), [138](#), [139](#)

agent intellect [98](#)

and *auctoritas* of Scripture [116](#)

and *auctoritas* of Thomas [123](#)

and ecclesiastical authority [116](#)

De articulis pertinentibus ad quatuorlibros Sent. Durandi [8](#), [79](#), [91](#)

auctoritates cited by [119](#)

Commentary on the Sentences [9](#), [70](#), [90](#), [100](#)

Correctiones super dicta Durandi in

Quodlibet Avenonense [179](#)

Correctiones super dicta Durandi in precedenti quodlibet [79](#)

Correctiones supra dicta Durandi de Sancto Prociano in Primo Quolibet [91](#)

Correctorium fratris Jacobi Metensis [66](#), [67](#)

Defensa doctrinae fratris Thomae [41](#), [76](#), [123](#)

deviations from Aquinas' teachings [52](#), [122](#)–[123](#)

Evidentiae contra Durandum super IV^{um} [79](#)

generalate [69](#)

intelligible species [97](#)–[98](#)

life [68](#)–[69](#)

Quodlibet II [76](#), [103](#)

Quodlibet III [76](#),

Reprobationes excusationum Durandi [8](#), [79](#), [104](#), [121](#)

De specie et intellectu [97](#)

theology, concept of [101](#)–[102](#), [103](#)

De verbum [97](#)

Hilary of Poitiers [111](#), [119](#)

Honorius III [13](#), [14](#)

Honorius IV [60](#)

Hubert of Guidi [80](#), [119](#)

Hugh of St. Cher [42](#), [47](#)

Hugh of St. Victor [48](#), [113](#)

Hugh Ripelin of Strasbourg [43](#)

Humbert of Romans [7](#), [15](#), [22](#), [25](#), [43](#), [44](#), [45](#), [46](#), [48](#), [109](#)

Humiliati [21](#)

illumination, Augustinian theory of [139](#)

Immaculate Conception controversy [132](#)

Innocent III [13](#)

Innocent IV [27](#), [29](#), [31](#)

intelligible species 97–98

Italian provinces 61

James of Lausanne 69, 75, 77, 130

Commentary on the Sentences 80

James of Metz 64, 65–67, 70, 72, 73, 89, 96, 100, 128

Commentary on the Sentences 66

relations, concept of 89

James of Viterbo 132

Jean de Pouilly 69

Jean Picard of Lichtenberg 62

Jerome 111, 119

Joachim of Fiore 49, 50, 93, 94, 96, 120, 128, 139

Trinitarian theology 117

Johannes Teutonicus 44

John XXII 63, 70, 71, 72, 78, 81, 82, 127–129, 133, 138

John Chrysostom 111

John Montson 132

John of Freiburg 62

Summa confessorum 127

John of Naples 61, 69, 77, 80, 118, 130

Commentary on the Sentences 77

Quodlibetale Parisiensis I 80

Quodlibetale Parisiensis II 80

John of Parma 77

John of Prato 77

John of St. Albans 30

John of St. Giles 30, 46, 47

John of Sterngrassen 62, 81, 82

John of Torino 42

John of Vercelli 63, 127

John Quidort of Paris 52, 62, 66, 68

Jordan of Saxony 7, 21, 22, 29

Justis petentiam 14

Kenny, Anthony 125

Kilwardy, Robert 3, 47, 62, 83, 121, 137

Knapwell, Richard 50, 54, 60, 63, 130

Koch, Joseph 5–6, 68, 70, 73

Krebs, Engelbert 64

Laurent Pignon 68

laybrothers 21

Leclercq, Jean 6

licentia ubique docendi 26

logic 36

Louis IX 27

Luke 10 15

Martin, Raymond 70

master (*magister*), office of 28

Master General, office of 17

master of students (*agister studentium*) 27, 28,

Master of the Sacred Palace (*agister in sacri palatii*) 63

Matthew of Acquasparta 61

Matthew Orsini of Rome 77

Meister Eckhart 42, 62, 64, 65, 87, 96, 138

mendicant orders 12, 118

auctoritates of 115

relationship between 51, 54–55

Melchior Cano 62
moderni, authority of 112–113
Munio Zaporra 19, 54

Nicholas IV 60, 63
Nicholas of Freiburg
 Summa 62

Nicolas Trivet 50
Nicoluccio de Ascolis 129
Nominalists 129

De novis religionibus prohibitis 15

Ockham, William 96, 115, 136
 Condemnation 82
 trial of 72

Olivi, John Peter 40, 50, 51, 96, 112
original sin 5
Oxford friars 76, 60, 61, 121

papacy 136
patristic authorities 111, 113, 120,
Peckham, John 40, 47, 50, 51, 60, 63, 121
perfecti 13, 14

Peter Abelard 40
 Sic et Non 38, 94

Peter Aureole 66, 70, 72, 76, 120
Peter Comestor

Historia scholastica 24
Peter d'Andria 126

Peter Ireland 47
Peter Lombard 93, 94, 103, 109, 110, 117, 119, 120
 Sentences 25, 26, 36, 38, 130

Peter of Auvergne 81
Peter of Bergamo 126
Peter of Palude 62, 63, 69, 71, 77, 80, 118, 130
 Commentary on the Sentences 8, 77, 80

Peter of Tarentaise 45, 61, 77
 auctoritas of 116

Philip the Fair 68
Plato 112

Porphyry 110
prior, office of 17–18

Priscian 110
Provence, province of 116
provincial, office of 17–18

quadrivium 36
Quasi lignum vitae 31
Quintilian 110
Quos vos in Christo 21

Rambert of Bologna 66
ratio studiorum 29, 45
Rambert of Bologna 54
Ramberto de Primadizzi
 Apologeticum veritatis 61
Raymond of Peñafort 16, 41, 127
Reginald of Orleans 22
relations 87–89
 logical 89

- predicamental 88–89
 - transcendental 89
- Religiosam vitam* 14
- Remigio de Girolami 61, 119, 129
- repetitiones* 24
- Rhineland Dominicans 62
- Richard Fishacre 47
- Richard Middleton 61
- Richard of St. Victor 48
- Robert Orford 54
- Roger Marston 50
- Roland of Cremona 43, 46, 47
- Rule of St. Augustine* 15
- sacraments 5
- scholasticism 37, 40–43
 - literary genres of 38–38
- Scripture 24, 26, 36, 101, 110, 111, 113, 119, 120
 - authority of 104, 112
- Scotism 37, 52,
- secular-mendicant conflict 31–32
- seculars 4, 118
- Sicilian province 61, 127
- Siger of Brabant 49–50
- Silvestra da Priero 132
- Spanish (or Ibernian) province 62
- Spirituals 72, 131, 136see also Franciscan Spirituals
- St. Jacques (convent of) 20, 27, 30, 41, 62, 71, 74
- studia artium* 23, 25, 45, 46
- studia biblia* 25
- studia grammaticalia* 23
- studia generalia* 20, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29–33, 133, 138
 - Bologna 30, 62
 - Cambridge 30
 - Cologne 30, 62, 138
 - Montpellier 30, 62, 138
 - Oxford 30, 37, 45, 62, 138
 - pontifical 27–28
 - Paris 30, 37, 62, 138
 - Toulouse 30
- studia naturalia* 25, 46, 48
- studia particularia* 25, 26
- syllabi of errors, see commissions
- Templars – investigation of, 68, 71
- theology 39
- theologians (*theologi*) 39–40; 113
- Thierry de Saxe 77
- Thomas Aquinas 3, 35, 36, 40, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 61, 62, 87, 109, 113, 114, 116, 117, 125, 137
 - auctoritas* of 4–5, 7, 10, 85–86, 91, 107, 116, 125, 126, 129, 130, 131, 132, 134
 - canonization 127, 129, 133
 - citations of in scholastic texts, 77
 - Commentary on the Sentences* 125, 130
 - critics of 50, 125, 127
 - death 136
 - followers 49, 52, 105, 138
 - hagiography 128
 - iconography 128
 - intelligible species 97

- relations 92
- teachings of 10, 74, 75, 81, 83, 121, 122, 123, 130, 133, 138
- texts 25, 77, 126, 127, 130, 140
- theology, concept of 100, 102, 103
- Trinitarian theology 91
- De Veritate* 29
- Secunda secundae* 59, 63, 129
- Summa contra gentiles* 41
- Summa theologiae* 38, 43, 61, 76, 101, 115, 130
- studies of 6
- Thomas de Soto 62
- Thomas de Vitoria 62
- Thomas of Cantimpre 43
- Thomas of Jorz 63
- Thomas of Naples 81
- Thomas of Strassbourg 115
- Thomas Sutton 59, 60
- Thomas Waleys 72
- Thomas Wylton
 - Quod in intellectu possint esse plures intellectioines simul* 79–80
- thomism 37, 53, 120, 135, 136, 139
- thomists, Dominican 52, 58, 59–64, 99, 101, 125, 127
- thomists, early 50, 52, 100, 121, 122, 132, 133, 138
- Torquemada 62
- trivium 36
- Tugwell, Simon 47
- unity of forms 60
- University of Naples 49
- University of Paris 26, 32, 36, 45, 62
- University of Salamanca 82
- Urban IV 31
- usus pauper* 51
- Victorines 112, 119
- Vincent of Beauvais 43, 46, 137
 - Opus universale de statu principalis* 42
 - De viri illustribus Ordinis Praedicatorum* 43
- visitation of 1278(English province) 53–54, 64, 66
- visitor, office of 18–19
- vita apostolica* 12, 13, 15, 17, 22
- Waldensians 13, 14, 15
- William de la Mare 87, 125, 136
 - Correctorium fratris Thomae* 51, 54, 61, 115
- William Hotham 54, 59, 60, 63, 121
- William Macclesfield 54
- William Peter Godin 27, 62, 63
- William of St. Amour 31, 32, 49
 - Tractatus de periculis novimorum tempo-rum* 31
- William of Tocco 128
- Yves of Caen 77
- Yves of Laon 77